# Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission Meeting

Monday, February 22, 2010

Sponsored by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Annapolis, Maryland

Held at the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Annapolis, Maryland

#### Maryland DNR Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission

February 22, 2010

#### **SFAC Members Present:**

Jim Gracie, Chair

David Birkett (proxy for Val Lynch)
Larry Coburn
Richard Gaines (proxy for Brandon White)
William Goldsborough
Brian Keehn
Edward O'Brien
David Sikorski
David Smith (proxy for William Windley)
Herbert Smith
Roger Trageser
James Wommack

#### SFAC Members Absent:

E. Neil Jacobs

## Maryland DNR Fisheries Service:

Marty Gary
Tom O'Connell

# Maryland DNR Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission

February 22, 2010

# $\underline{I}$ $\underline{N}$ $\underline{D}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{X}$

Walanna and Amazana and	<u>Page</u>
Welcome and Announcements  by Marty Gary, MD DNR Fisheries Service	4
NRP Report	
by Sergeant Brian Albert, DNRP <i>Questions and Answers</i>	6 11
Legislative and Regulatory Update  by Tom O'CONNELL & Harley Speir,	17
MD DNR Fisheries Services Questions and Answers	25
Inland Fisheries Update  by Don Cosden, MD DNR Fisheries Service  Questions and Answers	27 44
River Herring Management  by Bob Sadzinski, MD DNR Fisheries Services  Questions and Answers  MOTION	48 58 72
Summer Flounder Management  by Carrie Kennedy, MD DNR Fisheries Services  Questions and Answers  MOTION	73 81 85
Public Comments MOTION	88 100
ASMFC & Mid Atlantic Council Update	
by Tom O'Connell, MD DNR Fisheries Services <i>Questions and Answers</i>	102 114
Flexibility to Fish Act Discussion  by Steve Early, MD DNR Fisheries Services  Questions and Answers	121 126
Diamond Jim Update  by Marty Gary, MD DNR Fisheries Services	136
KEYNOTE: "" Indicates inaudible in transcript.	

#### E V E N I N G S E S S I O N

2

1

(6:00 p.m.)

3

#### Welcome and Announcements

4

### by Marty Gary, MD DNR Fisheries Service

5 6

MR. GARY: All right. Well, welcome Commissioners and the public to our meeting of the Sport Fish Advisory

7

Commission for February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2010.

8

Commissioners, if you could reference your folders.

9

We've had a couple of additions. And updated agenda is

10

located just prior to tab number one. So you might want to

11

reference that for tonight. Also, inserted into tab number

12

five, behind the draft Inland Regulation changes is a

13

monthly summary of Inland activities. That is something that

meetings. And we may -- if you like that, we may look to do

14

Don Cosden and his group plan to continue for each of the

15 16

that for other projects.

17

with a copy of the Bill summary for the flexibility to

18 19

restore America's Fisheries Act. And that was also e-mailed

20

to you. It's also up on the web site.

21

And just a couple of other quick announcements.

The tab 11, we've replaced the Diamond Jim update

22

Tonight's proxies, we have, Brandon White is unable to be

23

here, and Richie Gaines is Brandon's designated proxy.

24

Richie is former Sport Fisheries Advisory Commissioner and

25

Chairman, and welcome back Richie.

MR. GAINES: Thank you.

MR. GARY: Appreciate your presence here tonight.

Also, we understood that Dave Birkett would be sitting in for Val Lynch. I received an e-mail, but apparently he's not here. Maybe he'll still show up if he's coming from Ocean City.

Other then that I think we have -- and also we have Dave Smith. And Dave Smith is the designated proxy for Bill Windley. Bill, I understand, is not doing well from a health prospective. So we're sorry to hear that. But Dave is in as official proxy for Bill Windley.

All of the Commissioners -- Neil Jacobs, for the record, Neil Jacobs and Neil Jacobs designated proxy,

Solomon McCartney, were unable to attend tonight's meeting.

There are two sign-up sheets that are circulating. One for the Commissioners. And I actually have that here. If any Commissioners have not signed the sign-in sheet. All Commissioners have signed. There is also another sign-in sheet -- okay. Bill has one, I have one here. If anybody from the public has not signed one of these two sign-in sheets, please come up and grab that might, if you might.

Finally, two other items to mention. For public comments, the Chairman, Mr. Jim Gracie, will control public comments. Please do not speak unless you're recognized.

There will be opportunities during the meeting for public

km

comments.

I will recordings motions and actions as we develop those up on the screen. And I guess the last question I will ask is the -- is the -- is this font, is this size discernable to everybody. I can make it larger if you like, or we can change it on the fly.

Mr. Chairman, you're meeting.

MR. GRACIE: Thank you. We have an NRP Report first?

SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes, sir.

MR. GARY: Behind you.

#### NRP Report

#### by Sergeant Brian Albert, NRP

SERGEANT ALBERT: If I could just start out. I am

Sergeant Brian Albert, I am currently assigned to Western

Maryland. I am filling in for Captain Paul Heeney. Right

now he's in Key West, so I know we all feel real bad for him.

I got tagged to come down to the meeting.

The handout that I am sending out, is just some highlights of some cases that we've run over the last -- since the first of the year. General Tidal Fish. And excuse my voice, I am a little bit under the weather so -- but hopefully not contagious.

On January  $10^{\rm th}$  and  $11^{\rm th}$ , we had Cecil County Officers respond to a hoop net complaint, Susquehanna River.

The net was pulled and the investigation continues. I am not sure -- I didn't receive any followup from those officers that if they made any arrests or charged anyone that -- incident.

Striped bass, Queen Anne's County Officers cited a commercial fisherman with oversized striped bass and gill nets. The Kent County Officer, commercial waterman with over-the-limit striped bass, 170 pounds were seized.

Dorchester County, charged a waterman with an unattended gill net. Kent County, discovered and seized two anchored gill nets. Anne Arundel County, subject charged with an illegal gill net, west of -- near the West River.

Oysters and clams. You will see on the -- if anyone else needs a copy of this, I can get you one, if you didn't receive one.

I just cut and pasted a few things that were in there with the Talbot County things that were some of the press releases that were put out about the poaching and stuff. And I am not going to read that one for you. You guys can read that. If you have any questions on it, you know, I can certainly try and answer them. If not, I can get back with you on it.

In Somerset County, we've been doing some oyster saturation patrols throughout the Bay, which you guys have probably all seen is -- in the paper and news releases and

depends on where you're at, you know, the papers -- usually the Baltimore Sun does a pretty good job of reporting these.

Saint Mary's, we've conducted special enforcement patrol concentrating on oystering activity, nine boats were checked but no violating.

Then we have a list of the Saint Mary's County citations that were issued. You guys can look -- we have names and everything. And they're public records, that's why we went ahead and put them in here.

And then the warnings that were issued to the Golden Eye Seafood and Crabknockers Seafood in Leonardtown.

The grabs officers responded in Saint Mary's County to -- working in the closed season off Smith Point. Citation and warnings were issued for the violations.

Garrett County, non-tidal, one thing -- we've had some issues and I don't know if any of you guys are in -- familiar with it or having information on it, with West Virginia where the stocked areas are on the North Branch, where we can check the fisherman there. We're working with West Virginia Natural Resources.

There are officers there along the North Branch to work joint patrols to where we can -- we're going to be on a boat basically and because we can't, as a Maryland Officer, enter West Virginia to check them, even if they're fishing Maryland waters. There are liability issues. So we're going

to work with their agency to do some checks there.

The Fisheries Service, you know, we put trout into those areas. And we've had some issues brought to our attention over the past few years on that. So, you know, we've been working that area pretty heavy, so we're going to work it with West Virginia. They are a very limited resource over there. I think they have one officer for three or four counties. So we're going to do some joint patrols with them in the spring.

And then we've seen an increase of ice fisherman on Deep Creek Lake up until the last two -- it's been pretty -- pretty good snow cover on the lake right now. So -- a couple over the limit cases. We've been up -- I worked Garrett County for four years. And we were doing some research like -- we were getting information from the internet sites, they have pictures posted. The size of this, in between these tables with perch that they were taking. So, yes, it was unbelievable. Some small walleye but we can, you know, it was never anybody named.

It was always on -- I think it was called Fishing

Deep Creek dot com. If you just go to that site. They have

some ice fishermen that they looked like they were maybe in a

garage or something. But it was unbelievable the amount of

fish that was -- that was there.

One thing that we're always concerned with is the

3

5

7

11

12

13

15

17

21

25

safety of our officers who are out on that lake. You know, with the ice. Because usually the ice fishermen, it seems like they, you know, I've seen them lay boards down from me 4 to the table to get out -- or ladders to walk out across bad ice to get to the main lake, which -- we're not going to jeopardize our officers to go out there and get them. 6 But no problem with this year, two feet thick in 8 the middle. So --9 MR. GRACIE: I am curious about one thing here. 10 SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes, sir. MR. GRACIE: Between January 8th and February 16th, you claim you were checking ice fishermen on the Savage River Reservoir. I am wondering if this is just boilerplate, because Savage River Reservoir has been drained. 14 SERGEANT ALBERT: I know that. The final sentence. 16 Okay. That might have been -- this was prepared for me -they just cut --18 MR. GRACIE: Yes. 19 SERGEANT ALBERT: -- put it in there, Savage --20 MR. GRACIE: That's what it looks like. SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes. 22 MR. GRACIE: We did have some wile fluctuations in there for a while but -- I don't thin it had ice on it. 23 24 SERGEANT ALBERT: No. Since January 8<sup>th</sup>. It's easier to fish MR. GRACIE:

that way --

SERGEANT ALBERT: Maybe now but --

MR. GRACIE: All right.

SERGEANT ALBERT: If you have any questions -- the second handout was the jetty that Marty gave me. And I did some real quick calls. This was a combined effort -- the jetty down at Ocean City. Due to the increased activity. And we were getting numerous calls for people falling off that jetty and getting into the -- so the First Responders from the Fire and EMS from Ocean City, along with the Coast Guard, Natural Resource Police, it's all a combined effort. And they are going to post it as soon as the weather is permissible.

So, if you guys have any questions, hopefully I will have the answer, if I don't, I can get it to you.

#### Questions and Answers

MR. H. SMITH: Do you think the fines serve as much of a deterrent to power dredging oysters?

SERGEANT ALBERT: I think that -- and this has been put out there, and I haven't been on the shore since 1990 -- early nineties, so I haven't dealt with oysters much in the last 15 to 18 years. But I think it's -- some people feel that it's the cost of doing business. Yes, some --

MR. GRACIE: There's a bill in there to increase them substantially now.

SERGEANT ALBERT: Right.

MR. O'CONNELL: Just to clarify, the -- I think that it's obvious that the current penalty system has not been a deterrent. If you look at the level of poaching that has occurred. Last year Delegate Lafferty sponsored a bill to require the Department to increase the penalties by regulation. And we've gone through the process of working with the penalty work groups and we have a regulation that has been proposed right now and it will be come final on February 22<sup>nd</sup>, which is today.

So, hopefully with the increased fines and the ability to suspend licenses earlier, that will become more of a deterrent.

MR. GRACIE: And if the bill passes, the maximum penalties go up even more.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. Senator Frosh has a bill that, you know, on certain oyster violations could result in immediate suspension or revocation of a commercial license.

MR. GRACIE: I saw him at the Conservation Enforcement Act Legislation which is the foundation. There was a maximum \$10,000.00 fine on that.

SERGEANT ALBERT: There was -- and there a few more letters of suspension coming that I've been -- that I was made aware of. I don't know who those people are. But there was a few issued -- letters of suspension. Yes, sir.

1 (Voice - Away from mike) 2 There was a -- I think out in 3 Cumberland, --- a fellow had I quess a turkey, a white tailed 4 deer --5 SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes. 6 : He also had 40 traps. 7 SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes. 8 : Was my understanding. MR. And was 9 wondering if you knew, could find out for us what the species 10 ---. Just interested in whether he was poaching wile fish or whether he was, you know, fishing on some ---. 11 12 SERGEANT ALBERT: I will find out for you. 13 MR. : Yes. 14 SERGEANT ALBERT: But that was an ongoing case that 15 Corporal Mike Friend made -- and the search warrants and 16 everything. That was a long case. And you know, that -he's been a problem for a long time, obviously, if you read 17 18 the charges, but it was about three pages full. Yes, sir. MR. GAINES: Yes, I just wanted to follow up on 19 20 what Mr. Smith had asked. About three years ago we worked 21 with tidal fish real close to get the point system in place. 22 And I think it was probably enacted maybe two years ago when it actually took effect. So you're just now starting to see 23 24 those points add up for the bad guys where it starts to take 25 him out of the fishery.

1		The fine itself is just the cost of doing business.
2	But what's	s scares them most is losing that license during
3	their seas	son. And then actually losing it towards the end.
4	I think tl	hose have a deterrent. But that really hasn't
5	started ca	atching up with people because it hasn't been into
6	effect	what is it, three violations in two years or
7	something	•
8		MR. GRACIE: It all changed last year.
9		MR. GAINES: Oh, did it, really. Right.
10		SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes, sir.
11		(Voice - away from mike)
12		MR. : When you talk about closing down the
13	jetty, pos	sting the jetty in Ocean City, is it the Sound
14	jetty?	
15		SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes.
16		MR. : Sound jetty.
17		SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes.
18		MR. : And do you know where they will
19	start post	ting?
20		SERGEANT ALBERT: No, I am not sure. Wherever they
21	post it.	I can get back with you and let you know.
22		MR. : I was just wondering.
23		MR. SIKORSKI: I believe the closure occurs at the
24	hump. If	you are familiar with it, there's a
25		MR. : Yes.

1	MR. SIKORSKI: Where there are uniform rocks, that
2	come up and then it comes up to a large hump.
3	MR. : Right.
4	MR. SIKORSKI: And then after that hump, it just
5	seems to be kind of
6	MR. : Right. It's flattened out there.
7	MR. SIKORSKI: Yes.
8	SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes, it says the eastern third of
9	the jetty is closed to all foot traffic and
10	MR. GRACIE: All foot traffic, so you can't go out
11	there.
12	SERGEANT ALBERT: Right.
13	MR. GRACIE: Whether your fishing or not?
14	SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes.
15	MR. GRACIE: Any other questions for fisheries?
16	Any questions from the public?
17	MR. McGUIRE: Yes.
18	MR. GRACIE: Go ahead.
19	MR. McGUIRE: Yes, sir. I just read an article or
20	maybe this news release today about
21	MR. GRACIE: Scott, if you don't mind, can you come
22	up and use the mike. And identify yourself.
23	MR. McGUIRE: Sure. Scott McGuire, Hollywood,
24	Maryland. I just read a news release today about some bust
25	fish houses on the Eastern Shore.

1	SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes.
2	MR. McGUIRE: Could you tell us anything about
3	those?
4	SERGEANT ALBERT: Basically the news release is
5	what I there was an undercover operation that took place.
6	It was about two years in length. All the warrants and all
7	the documents right now, all the charging will be sealed for
8	at least 30 days, possibly longer. I know that the Fish
9	and Wildlife was involved. There were federal charges
10	involved. But it was three seafood companies, basically, in
11	Dorchester County that was basically the focus of the
12	operation.
13	That's basically all I have on it in a nutshell. I
14	received the same thing, you know, I think the WBOC had it
15	is that where you read it?
16	MR. McGUIRE: I don't recall.
17	SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes. Okay. It probably went out
18	to a lot of media outlets.
19	MR. GRACIE: Next question.
20	SERGEANT ALBERT: Yes, sir.
21	MR. GRACIE: Tom.
22	MR. O'CONNELL: I am sorry.
23	MR. GRACIE: No, no. Hold up. Bill
24	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: No, no, this is something else.
25	I missed my opportunity earlier to introduce everybody my
ļ	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

17 proxy, John Page Williams, who is going to be filling in for me at the next meeting. I forgot about that. MR. GRACIE: Thank you. Go ahead, Tom. Legislative and Regulatory Update by Tom O'Connell and Harley Speir, MD DNR Fisheries Services MR. O'CONNELL: Sure. This is the Legislative and Regulatory update. And I will go over most of it. I may need Harley to help me out on some of the details. This information was sent to you guys like a week Would you prefer me to go through it item by item or

can I highlight some of the relative things.

MR. GRACIE: Anybody need a detailed rendition? had it a week ago. Okay.

MR. O'CONNELL: I can highlight and then if you have any questions you can follow back up with me.

Under regulations, I think the Catch-and-release Striped Bass Recreational Season, the comment ended on February 3rd, and the Department is going forward as proposed. And the effective date of that will be March  $22^{nd}$ . Initially it was thought that it could be in place by March 8th, but it's going to be March  $22^{nd}$ .

Upcoming regulations, probably the oyster proposal is probably most relevant to this group. The Department is taking an extended period of time to review the public Initially we were hoping for February 19<sup>th</sup>.

We've been meeting with each of the different stake holder groups to exchange our perspectives on the comments that we received. And at this point in time, probably the earliest will be towards the end of March but more likely the beginning of April. Given the amount of time we need to take to develop all the coordinate language once the final decision is made.

Under legislation, a lot of activity going on this year. Mostly with oysters. There are a few departmental bills, Senate Bill 29, Preparation of Fishery Management Plans. This is implementation of one of the recommendations of the task force of fisheries management. This bill will give the Department the authority to develop fisheries management plans based upon the need rather then having to go back and modify the list of species and statute for each year.

So, if there's a species for which we believe there's a need for development of a fisheries management plan to give us the regulatory authority that will be assessed in coordination with both the Sport Fish and Tidal Fish Advisory Commission and if proved necessary the Department will have the ability to draft that plan.

MR. GRACIE: Will that apply to tidal and non-tidal?

MR. O'CONNELL: It will apply to tidal and

non-tidal, but probably most relevant to tidal. It does apply to both.

MR. GRACIE: Okay.

MR. O'CONNELL: I will go over through some of the departmentals and I will try to summarize the oyster ones.

Senate Bill 84, this is a private sponsor but something that the Department was interested in doing. This would establish staggered reappointments for both the Sport Fish and Tidal Fish Advisory Commissioners. And initially proposed to add three members to the Sport Fisheries Advisory Commission and the bill has been amended to also add three members to Tidal Fish Advisory Commission.

This largely came about when we were reforming the membership of this body and recognized the number of stakeholder interest groups has been expanded and the need to add more members to get adequate representation of the recreational fishing community.

House Bill 98 is another departmental. Just to clarify some loopholes with the tidal fish licenses.

Currently if -- if a tidal fish license is suspended that suspension goes with the license and not with the individual. So if Jim Gracie had a commercial license and had his license suspended. The license is suspended. But if I had a license that I wasn't using I could transfer that to Jim and Jim could be back on the water the next day.

So this would clarify that the individual whose licence was suspended would not be able to commercially fish during that suspension period.

The bill also would require the Department to work with the Sport Fish and Tidal Fish Advisory Commission to develop penalties for federal violations. Right now we don't have the ability to assign penalties and suspensions for federal violations. We had some of that a couple of years ago in striped bass. This would give us the ability to penalize someone for federal violations.

The -- with regards to the oyster bills, there are a number of oyster bills that would significantly impede the Department from implement the Governor's oyster proposal. You can go through the list for yourself. Several of them would remove the Department's authority for several aspects of managing oysters, from taking away our authority to establishing new sanctuaries and give that authority to the Legislature. To delay implementation of new sanctuaries for a year and a half to two years.

To taking away our authority to regulate in certain gears like power dredges. Giving authority for regulating power dredges to the County Oyster Committees, which is a -- a five member group of commercial fishermen, oystermen.

So there are a lot of bills to go -- to significantly affect our ability to go forward with the

oyster proposal.

Then Recreational Sport Fish and License Bill was finally submitted last week. It's not on this list. But it's House Bill 1345. And if you -- we can get you a copy of that list.

There are a couple of issues that we're aware of after the bill -- during the bill's drafting stage that we're trying to address. The coastal community has raised significant concerns about the Tidal Non-Resident License, which had historically been \$15.00, whether you are a resident or non-resident. This bill would require reciprocity, so a non-resident would have to pay \$15.00 or whatever their state charges for non-residents, whichever the higher fee is.

The bait and tackle shops they're concerned about, you know, it's a busy time of year down there. People are coming in. There's confusion. Non-residents coming to the counter, I want my license. Well, what state are you from. Sales person is going to have to get on the computer to look it up. Or have a sheet of paper here. It's going to take more time.

Also if you get two different non-residents coming to the table. You may be telling Florida it's \$47.00, you may be telling someone from Pennsylvania it's \$15.00.

So there are some legitimate concerns, you know,

reciprocity is not going to create significant revenues, on the one hand. It is a fairness issue with regards to what each state charges non-residents. On the other hand we're not trying to create a deterrence for fishing in Maryland.

So, there's a couple of options we're looking at.

One would be simply to drop reciprocity for non-resident

tidal licenses. It would be \$15.00 for annual, \$6.00 for non

-- for a seven day license.

The other option, which seems to be preferred, by some of the spokespersons down on the coastal bays, is just to establish a fixed non-resident fee. That is slightly higher then the resident. And involved 30 percent however, which is kind of the rate for -- non-tidal residents minus the reciprocity part of it. So, perhaps like something in the neighborhood of \$22.00 for a non-resident tidal or a \$9.00 for a seven day non-resident.

We're going to be working through those issues in the weeks ahead of us.

MR. GRACIE: There's no bill in yet?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, there is. House Bill 1345.

There also may -- there also has been some concerns -- there has been less vocal but could develop with the trout stamp.

Prior to the -- currently the trout stamp is \$5.00, whether you are a resident or non-resident. The current bill would be \$5.00 or reciprocity, what your state would charge

Maryland resident for fishing for trout. 2 There is some concern out in Western Maryland, that 3 in certain states for example, like in Virginia, which has 4 high non-resident trout stamp fees, it could be a deterrent 5 to business and could impact, you know, guides and tackle shops. So we're keeping an eye on that one. And that may be 6 7 another issue that we have to discuss further. 8 MR. COSDEN: \$36.00 for Virginia. Trout stamps, that's what they charge in Virginia. 9 10 MR. GRACIE: Why don't we talk to them and get them 11 to lower theirs. 12 MR. COSDEN: That would be nice. 13 It gets silly, you know. MR. GRACIE: They're 14 shooting themselves in the foot. 15 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. 16 MR. GARY: That was Don Cosden our Assistant 17 Director. Don. 18 MR. O'CONNELL: And then lastly which there is a 19 bill -- Conservation Law Enforcement Act, it's intended to 20 highlight the importance of enforcing public trust resources. 21 And tries to create some creative new ways of utilizing the 22 existing funding sources to support Natural Resources 23 enforcement. 24 I don't know, Jim, if you want add any more --25 MR. GRACIE: As of now, there are no fees attached

to the bill. We had hoped to come up with three sources of, potential sources of revenue, and the leadership in the 2 3 Senate said no. 4 So, the bill increases penalties. It also -- one 5 of the interesting penalties is putting -- vehicle monitoring system, is that what it is, as a condition of probation on 6 7 anybody who violates oyster laws. So that you know where 8 they are day and night. And that's recorded. 9 Increases the maximum penalty for -- illegally harvesting oysters to \$10,000.00, \$2,500.00 for one 10 11 violation. If you are -- are in the sanctuary or doing 12 something like that. 13 The other issue was -- drawing a blank here. 14 Somebody help me out. No body was here during that 15 discussion. Oh. 16 MR. O'CONNELL: Jim, canoes. 17 MR. GRACIE: I am sorry. 18 MR. O'CONNELL: Canoes. Was that the ---? 19 MR. GRACIE: No. No. There is one other penalty 20 measure and for some reason escaped my mind. I think the 21 bill -- and I didn't write it down. I just saw an e-mail 22 from Miles and I think it was 653. But I may not have it 23 right, so --24 MR. O'CONNELL: We can follow up tomorrow --25

MR. GRACIE: Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: And send it out. And the one I did not mention, Senate Bill 342 is the last one on this list here. On that is Senator Frosh's bill. Which would, for certain oyster violations for example, oystering in a closed or prohibited area, using illegal gear, harvesting oysters outside of legal time, would require the Department to revoke the license. I mentioned earlier it would be suspend or revoke. It is actually revoke the license through a contested case hearing.

MR. GRACIE: I am sorry. I remember the other provision in the bill. It allows the Department the right to inspect -- to carry the oyster tagging program to the retail level. Right now it's only at the wholesale level. So, you know, these guys are going out at night and giving them to retailers. And there is no way to track that. So that was the other one.

#### Questions and Answers

MR. GRACIE: I have a question about House Bill 89.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. GRACIE: Acquaculture.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. GRACIE: There is a way of premium fees. It says that it will exempt them from the fees. It doesn't exempt them from the permits, does it?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.

(301)577-5882

MR. GRACIE: Okay. You just finished talked about 1 2 the --3 MR. O'CONNELL: There were concerns with the 4 application fees for NDE for acquaculture for, could range 5 into thousands of dollars and there were concerns of that to be determined. So this bill, I think through an amendment, 6 7 would waive that fee for a period of time, perhaps three 8 years. And then it would go back to the acquaculture 9 coordinating council for review to determine if those fees 10 should be reinstated. 11 MR. GRACIE: Thank you. 12 MR. D. SMITH: Hey, Tom. The catch-and-release on 13 the first page of striped bass, is that an error the last 14 regulation on the monitor? 15 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. Yes. There is no prohibition 16 during the week on Monday, Wednesday and Friday. 17 MR. D. SMITH: Okay. Thanks. 18 MR. KEEHN: And Marty, if you can make sure we 19 clarify that on the web page, with this handout. 20 MR. GARY: It is clarified on the web page. 21 MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. Thanks, Dave. We're just 22 trying to sneak --23 (Laughter) 24 MR. KEEHN: That's what I figured you guys were 25 trying to do. And that's fine.

1 MR. O'CONNELL: Testing you, Dave. Testing you. 2 MR. KEEHN: Yes, Yes. 3 MR. GRACIE: You thought you would pull a fast one 4 on John. 5 (Laughter) 6 MR. O'CONNELL: Any other questions? 7 MR. GRACIE: Anything else? 8 MR. O'CONNELL: I believe there's a couple more 9 issues, that are coming in, that have been filed by ---10 MR. GRACIE: Non-friendly? 11 (Off mike) 12 : One is a --- for Kent County ---. 13 This was introduced on Friday. Like a person may possess up 14 to five percent of the total catch, is undersized fish. 15 there are two ---. 16 MR. GRACIE: There is a reaction, there is a huge 17 reaction from the watermen to what's going on there. Thank 18 Anything else? Okay. Inland Fisheries updated. you, Tom. 19 Don. Don, if you don't mind, can you come over here to this 20 microphone. 21 Inland Fisheries Update 22 by Don Cosden, MD DNR Fisheries Service 23 MR. COSDEN: Don Cosden, by the way. Okay. 24 guys might have seen the announcement with the meeting 25 announcement that we were holding a tidal management

roundtable today. We held a meeting from two to three, or two to five, I am sorry, Roger was there. And it was pretty well attended. I was pretty, pretty happy with folks participating. We had folks from Delaware talk about the Nanticoke River and their program.

Put this information on our web site. There is a tidal large mouth bass page on the web site that really has a lot of new information on it. Our Tidal Bass Manager,

Joe Lutz is doing a great job. So -- we may even have the MP3 audio file for the entire three hours if anybody is interested. Real quick --

MR. GRACIE: Did you put it on You Tube?

MR. COSDEN: It maybe You Tube. We didn't video. The monthly report, I don't know if we got that out. I was hoping to get that out to you guys earlier. Typically it's -- we get it just in time for me to take a look at it. It has to be written by our manager and then it gets all compiled and gets sent to me.

And I finally got it out to you guys. I will try and get it e-mailed out earlier if we can move up the process a little bit. It doesn't have to be at the end of the month. But if you guys look it through and you think it's -- you think it's worthwhile, we'll continue to do this.

I am just going to hit a couple of highlights from this -- this report. And you can look at the rest. And if

you see something or have questions about, just let me know. 2 Number one on the list unfortunately is the Savage 3 River Reservoir, you guys have heard me talk about this for 4 the last year probably. And they finally brought that 5 reservoir all the way down to repair the gates at the end of January. As anticipated we had some real sediment issues. 6 7 Only probably more then we had anticipated. Conditions were 8 much worse during the draw-down. 9 And actually I have a couple of -- Marty, can you 10 give me your desktop for a minute there. I have a couple of 11 photos, just going to run through them real quick for you. 12 If you go to that one right there. I think that's it. 13 (Slide) 14 These are from the engineers doing the project. 15 They're replacing the flood gates out there. And just go 16 ahead and run through these pictures. 17 (Slide) 18 This is the dam right here. This is the river 19 coming down and the intake it right over there. And you can 20 see this huge amount of sediment right here well -- a fair 21 amount of that apparently is sloughed off and is run down 22 stream. Go ahead, Marty. 23 (Slide) 24 Another shot of it. Go on through. 25 (Slide)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That is the intake. That's where all the action And you can see -- we sent out a report on this with some pictures of the stream, but this is why the stream is looking the way it does right now. Okay. (Slide) All right. Keep on cycling them through and see what else they have there. Go on up. (Slide) This is actually the -- this is the broken gate. Go down one more. (Slide) And that was the stem. That was the cause of the problem. There's four gates there. This one was a backup emergency gate. And two years ago, they test these gates annually, and that thing just -- broke in half. They had no use of it. And so if the other gate went they would have no way to pass half of the water discharged through the facility. Because it couldn't open, right? MR. GRACIE: MR. COSDEN: Yes. MR. GRACIE: It was closed --I can't say that that's the truth. MR. COSDEN: don't know for sure. MR. GRACIE: I thought that's what it was. But at any rate, they have one gate in MR. COSDEN:

as of Friday. Once they get the second upper gate in they can control the water. They can actually -- they say the will start to refill the reservoir.

Now, I don't think they'll go above a certain level because they still have to work in the tunnel to get the other two gates in. But they can potentially hold back any more sediment and -- and there's -- as you can see in that picture, plenty of sediment left in the lake. And there's about six inches of precipitation in the snow pack as of last Tuesday up in the drainage so --

MR. GRACIE: That's six inches of water -- no, snow.

MR. COSDEN: Yes, six inches of rain in the snow pack that -- could be just another devastating shot. With the contractors working seven days a week, double shifts. They recognize the situation. Not only a danger, a flood danger, not being able to control that flow down stream, but the sediment. And also the loss of that precipitation. You know, when they go to refill the reservoir in March they would like to be able to catch that precipitation as it comes down. We have our fingers crossed.

Right now, I won't go into what we're thinking of as far as where we're going to go with restoration efforts, but as soon as -- as soon as conditions permit we'll be doing some assessment of fish populations. We'll be taking a look

at the benthics, all the bugs. We sampled there last year so we have a real good snapshot of what was there before all this happened.

And just some habitat assessments with -- what the load is. We're hoping that a large discharge from the dam, once we get that thing filled, is going to flush a lot of the fine sediments out. But -- in the larger pools, it's a -- quite a load apparently. So --

Moving on. Monthly report, there was a mention of regulation to target didymo. And it's hard to regulate didymo, which is just a microscopic organism that's an evasive sort of situation. But what they're looking at is eventually limiting the use or eliminating the use of ---.

We're looking at probably grandfathering this in over a year or two. But a -- that's what -- eventually that will be the tact that we will take.

I would say that in the light of the sediment load that we're seeing in the Savage, the fact that we have whirling disease, right around the corner in the north branch, keeping the clean -- keeping clean gear may be more important then ever. Because we're going to have the perfect habitat for that Tubifex worm, which is the intermediate host for whirling disease. So this is not only a didymo deterrent, but it's something that might help prevent the spread of whirling disease.

	33
1	MR. COBURN: Are you talking about making law? Of
2	using a no felt soles?
3	MR. COSDEN: Down the road, that's what we're
4	looking at, yes.
5	MR. COBURN: And you're looking at about a two
6	year
7	MR. COSDEN: I don't know what the time frame is.
8	First we need to decide how they're going to go about it,
9	whether they're going to add this to the list of injurious
10	species, I think it's called. And then we can regulate that
11	way. But we could probably do it by regulation, it wouldn't
12	have to be legislation. So that would
13	(Off mike)
14	MR. : So the grandfather phase in period
15	is that the whole
16	MR. COSDEN: The phase in period yes, so that
17	people get rid of felt soles because just bought boots he
18	doesn't have to chuck them immediately. Certainly we're
19	probably
20	MR. : Yes, he does.
21	MR. COSDEN: Well, we're probably
22	(Laughter)
23	MR. GRACIE: What are you going to do with all
24	those felt soles you have in the shop.
25	MR. COSDEN: We'll figure something out. No, as

soon as we're sure that we're going this way --

MR. GRACIE: It's a national change.

MR. COSDEN: I think we'll just -- we'll get the word out ahead of time so people if they're looking to buying new boots, they aren't going to buy felts and then -- and we're going to change the reg next year.

Another thing that's one there, monthly report that might be of interest to you. We had a project going with the Maryland Department of the Environment to look at the stream use classifications right now. They did a -- they do a review periodically.

And the fact that we now have a database manager who has developed a good set of maps from the MDE database for us, and I want to thank everybody on the task force who helped to work through that whole process and support the idea of us getting that kind of help, has really helped us out.

We created a set of maps which immediately we recognized a couple of areas that sort of fell through the cracks within the -- and we'll be able to get better projections on those streams. And we're doing them a -- a larger -- discussion with MDE about getting some sort of Class IV protections which are higher then the average stream gets.

Right now they only do Class IV for stock

transferrings. Which aren't wild transferrings. And we've made the case that we don't necessarily want to stock a stream that has better water quality in order to give it a higher level of protection. We can't stock all steams. We don't have enough trout. Some streams are posted, we're not going to stock them. But they still deserve that level of protection. So, the discussion is there some sort of extra Class IV that we could use.

Finally in the monthly report it mentions guys that did a lot of work at the end of the season to discuss a lot of the waters that we have for fishing. And this is all in what they called the Year End Review. It's on our web site. They did it at the end of every season when the weekly fishing reports stop. And I've gotten a lot of good comments about the information that is there. And I recommend all you guys take a look at that.

It really is a compilation of some survey information and just general information about all these areas that biologists have been working in. Might give you some hot tips for fishing next year.

The next thing I have -- we have put together set of draft regulations or possible draft proposals. Our pubic meetings typically start in early April. We have five public meetings across the state where we bring these proposals to the public and talk about them. You guys a lot of those.

Look them through, I am not going to go through all of them but the ones that may be of the biggest interest.

Catoctin Creek delayed harvest area, I talked about a while back. Said that I thought we may have to get rid of that area because of private property and the town -- and this is in a town park. It's an area that -- the town is really high on having us continue to stock and so we've reached an agreement. They're going to post. And try and patrol for the private property violations, which means that the anglers have to stay on the bank, on the park side, on the right side of the stream.

And hopefully we can work an arrangement with NRP to keep their eye on that, too. We don't want -- apparently someone camped on this fellow's property last year. And they've routinely go over there and tramp up and down his banks. And a -- we just need to keep -- have people respect people's private property if we're going to keep an area like this open. So -- but we do -- we will continue to stock this and keep it under late harvest.

We're going to also look at removing any closures on impoundments that have warm water species. And we do close some areas for trout stocking and although we've taken a lot of the impoundments off of the list, there are still some that get closed for a week, two weeks, or three weeks, right in the early spring for trout stocking. If the weather

is nice, people might want to fish. And it just doesn't make sense to keep people out of an area because we may be stocking trout there next week.

So, we're going to open those up. It means some of the folks might follow the truck right to the lake, but that's not too big an issue. We basically put a big tube out and shoot those fish right out into the center of the lake anyhow, at least they're not dipping them out of the lake with a bucket.

Another -- we current have a regulation that says that you can only have two hooks per line. And we're proposing to increase that to three. The main reason for that is a lot of guys that fish, nymph rigs, double nymphs, and when we always used to use an indicator, a lot of guys are now going to like a floating hopper type of pattern, and on big waters that's a popular way to fish.

And I've -- I've often though, geez, I would like to be able to rig like that when I was on the water and couldn't. But we've also had some phone calls about it just in the last season. And I ran it by our managers and they didn't see any issues in increasing three hooks per line.

One biggy here, we're going to remove -- talking about removing the catch-and-release bass fishing designation on the lower part of the river there from -- basically from White's Ferry up -- it goes up into the Monocacy River. This

is something that's been in place for about 15 years. And we've looked at the data. We've looked at the data about three years ago when we looked at another special management area, there's no indication that there is any difference in populations between those two areas. The idea originally was we'll have more big fish if we're not killing fish, and keeping -- harvesting fish.

In the upper management area that we removed two years ago, there was no difference in populations between there and the rest of the river. We removed that population. We haven't seen a change. And what we heard in our -- in our people who did sort of a creel survey, basically asking questions three or four years ago, most of the bass anglers wouldn't keep a bass anyhow.

We had a maximum size limit there trying to reduce the number of small bass. Hoping people would actually keep some small bass. Most of the guys that really catch bass are good at it, won't keep them, period. So the regulation doesn't make any sense.

So, we will have a small data report on that for you guys, if you want to look at it, in the next meeting.

MR. GRACIE: Will you be prepared to present that at the hearing?

MR. COSDEN: Yes. We'll have that at all the meetings and we can bring that to you as well. I suspect

there will be some push-back on that. There are some clubs that really favor, you know, catch-and-release. And -- but 2 3 the data just aren't supporting it right now. Yes, sir. 4 MR. H. SMITH: Just one question on the three hooks 5 per line. This -- permit these treble hooks with power bait, which is something that I've seen often. 6 7 MR. COSDEN: Well, right now you could use a treble hook with a power bait if you wanted because a treble hook is 8 actually considered a single hook. 9 10 MR. H. SMITH: It's a single hook. 11 MR. COSDEN: Yes. And in fact if you have a lure 12 that has two treble hooks on it --13 MR. H. SMITH: It's a single. 14 MR. COSDEN: -- that's considered a single unit. 15 single hook. So, if you wanted to fish three --- more power 16 to you but. 17 (Laughter) 18 MR. GRACIE: You are going to spend a lot of time untangling the line. Not much time. 19 20 MR. H. SMITH: I called them ---. 21 MR. GRACIE: Now they're advertising rocket --22 it's like Target, shopping at Target. 23 MR. COSDEN: Also the opening day of -- the opening 24 time for put and take trout fishing, there's a proposal to 25 move that back from 5:30 to 6:30.

MR. GRACIE: Why?

MR. COSDEN: We had -- we had several questions about it, one of last year's meetings. And then a fellow who actually wrote into the Kenney, at the Baltimore Sun, in I think it's called "Ask a Biologist" piece that they have all the time. And they were contending that at 5:30 in the morning it's dark, you have to stumble down to the stream, and you're actually starting to fish in the dark. And although I didn't remember that being the case, with the change in Daylight Savings Time the first spring opening, it is pitch black dark apparently.

This fellow that talked to me, that had written into the Sun, said I had two kids, I am taking them down there, I am trying to teach them to fish. And I got a bunch of guys whizzing lines all over the place. And I got two kids throwing barbed hooks out here in the middle of the dark. We thought about it and felt like it would make it easier for enforcement as well if it was put back to where there was some kind of light. It's related -- it would make much difference later in the season when you get light earlier. But a --

MR. COBURN: You are going to get a letter now, on 5:30, once you change the clock.

MR. GAINES: Just do it like they do hunting. Sunrise.

1 MR. COSDEN: Well, we --2 MR. GAINES: At sunrise. 3 MR. COSDEN: Well, we discussed that. That's more 4 of a moving target. 5 MR. GAINES: Listed in all the books. MR. GRACIE: Fishermen aren't as smart as hunters, 6 7 I guess. To keep track of sunrise and sunset. 8 MR. COSDEN: I didn't want to say that. 9 implying that. 10 MR. GRACIE: It's true in some cases. 11 MR. GAINES: Because we might change Daylight 12 Savings Time to save more money. You know, how the 13 government does that, and you don't have the change the law 14 every time. 15 Well -- this is open for discussion. MR. COSDEN: 16 And we'll take it to the public so that we could get push-17 back from those guys that like to get there 5:00 quick and go 18 home. All right. 19 I will let you guys go over the regulations there. 20 And I will be prepared to answer questions at the next 21 meeting. If we still have time. See, the public meetings 22 are in April. So I can take your comments before we even go 23 to the public meetings with them. 24 One thing that occurred to me, Office Albert was 25 talking about the -- the big piles of yellow perch that --

that we saw pictures of previously up in Deep Creek Lake. We did have a ten fish creel limit go in effect this year, for the first time. And we got -- as much as we try and take this information to the public, let people know, come to our meetings, tell us what you think, you never find out what people think until afterwards.

And we had some pretty irate phone calls. But I do think that it was important to get that under control. That did occur, really large catches. And I had one fellow tell me, well, you know, I have caught 50 yellow perch before.

And I can go right over to the Youghiogheny Reservoir and catch 50 and take them home.

But the population in Deep Creek Lake is really -it's a popular fish there and it's a draw for kids all summer
long. You can catch yellow perch and pan fish when you can't
catch anything else. It's just important to us to keep that
population strong and not be over fishing. So --

Anyhow, just a couple more items. Officer Albert also mentioned about enforcement on the north branch. Right now -- they're not allowed to go into West Virginia to enforce the regulations on the north branch even though they're our regulations.

There is legislation in the works. It won't occur in this Session, but Delegate Beitzel has been talking with West Virginia and we're looking at legislation in both states

that would allow, NRP, Maryland NRP, to drive into an area like -- Barnum, where there is no -- virtually no access from the Maryland side. You have to get in a boat to actually patrol that area. And this would allow those fellows to drive over there and observe and write tickets. So, hopefully in the next Legislative Session that's going to happen.

And finally, we've also established an MOU with the two western regions of NRP to provide some additional funding for overtime. And the idea, we've given them a list of hot spots that we want to keep an eye on. But this is going to be more of a target thing, we're to meet, the regional managers are going to meet with the regional NRP officers and talk, you know, about what's happening, what I heard last week about poaching or whatever is going on. So, it's going to allow us to say we really need, you know, some extra eyes over here, can you guys get over there. It will be really helpful.

So, if you guys hear thing, you know, it doesn't always get reported to NRP, it doesn't always get reported to us, but you hear things, let us know, because our regional managers can go right to the NRP officers and say can you spend a couple of nights out here checking this place out.

MR. GRACIE: Who much money you talking about?
MR. COSDEN: \$50,000.00.

(301)577-5882

1 MR. GRACIE: Fifty. 2 And that's all I have. MR. COSDEN: 3 MR. GRACIE: Any questions? 4 MR. COSDEN: Any questions? Roger. 5 Questions and Answers 6 MR. TRAGESER: I don't have a question but I just 7 wanted to bring this up while we got Don and his kind of 8 department up. Apparently Salisbury has been awarded a 9 \$100,000 grant from the Waterway Improvement Fund to remove some old barges up on the -- not prong of the Wicomico River. 10 11 And I talked to Don about this just briefly before 12 we started. Now, it's not an area that is probably fished 13 directly by a lot of bass fishermen, but it does provide 14 habitat for spawning fish. And this -- report I have here, 15 they're claiming that -- they find it necessary to pull these 16 barges for navigation on the river and potential source of 17 pollution in the river. I don't know if too many old barges 18 that have been in the water for any length of time that all 19 of a sudden start to develop pollution potential problems 20 with them. 21 And from the navigation end, Don says that he 22 thinks this area is back in a canal where there's not really 23 any navigation going on anyway. 24 MR. GRACIE: It's upstream with the ponded areas, 25 isn't it.

1 MR. COSDEN: No, it's below the pond. 2 MR. TRAGESER: No, it's below the pond. 3 MR. COSDEN: It's right where one of the main ponds 4 comes in. And basically it ends right there. It's been 5 channelized, it's all bulkheaded and it's all industrial area 6 around there, anyhow. 7 MR. TRAGESER: So, I don't know what really what 8 rules or regs or lack of rules and regs are in place where, 9 you know, an area that we talk about, you know, habitat 10 getting destroyed by means other then people, literally 11 pulling it out -- you know, whether there is some regulations 12 that can go into place or how is it -- how would it be deemed 13 to be able to review something like this. It doesn't sound 14 to me like these things really need to be pulled out for any 15 potential navigation or pollution address. 16 MR. GRACIE: They have to get a permit to do it. 17 MR. COSDEN: They have to get a permit and it would 18 be a public participation process in the permit. 19 You know, I think this was a case where the city 20 came to DNR and they wanted to remove this. If we had been 21 in the process earlier we might have brought up -- we would 22 have brought up the fact that, well, this is a potential 23 habitat. And my feeling is we just need to be more involved 24 in -- I mean this is a part of what the Boating 25 Administration does. They do remove hazzards and stuff from

the water. But --

MR. GRACIE: Tom.

MR. COSDEN: Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: After Don brought the issue to my attention I spoke to Bob Gaudette who is my counterpart in boating and just encouraged earlier communication on these types of removals with fisheries.

I guess my question is, Roger, is the concern that the removal will occur during the spawning period or is it kind of a longer lasting impact. Because my understanding at this point in time --

MR. TRAGESER: Well, I think it will be a longer lasting impact. If it's in an area that some or many consider to be, you know, beneficial to spawning year in and year out, and I don't know that you are going to do anything about it right now. It's been awarded. So if they hold off after the spawn, it's fine. But once it's gone any benefit that it had to that spawning area is gone as well. And I don't know whether it's going to, you know, stir up more sediment or anything for a while. Probably dissipate after a period but still.

MR. O'CONNELL: You know, through Don's involvement it is my understanding that they have agreed to not remove the barges until after the spawning season, so at least any short terms impacts this year should be mitigated. I will

just kind of figure out -- sort of longer term -- and some of 2 the --3 MR. TRAGESER: Probably longer term then anything 4 else. 5 MR. O'CONNELL: Is it better to have those barges there then not to have them there, from ---, I guess. 6 7 MR. TRAGESER: I would think. It's covered --8 MR. COSDEN: Typically --9 MR. TRAGESER: -- protection. Absolutely. 10 MR. COSDEN: Yes. You know, that type of stuff is heavily used by fish like large mouth so -- that's why I 11 12 would like to be in the process early on, so we can identify 13 whether we think there would be some negative impacts from --14 removing, you know, old boats, barges and stuff. 15 These things -- you know, we put this stuff out in the Bay and call it habitat. So --16 17 MR. GRACIE: Has this gone through Environmental 18 Review yet? Is there a permit application? 19 MR. COSDEN: Well, apparently -- yes, they've been 20 awarded a grant. Everything is a go. And they were going to 21 start in the spring. They've agreed to hold off, wait until 22 the end of the spawning period, until late June. 23 MR. GRACIE: You're saying as if the grant implies 24 that they have a permit. It doesn't necessarily. 25 MR. COSDEN: Well, okay. We'll talk about it.

1	Okay.
2	(Off mike)
3	SERGEANT ALBERT: A followup to your question. In
4	the search warrant they will trout.
5	MR. COSDEN: There are rainbow trout.
6	SERGEANT ALBERT: And I assume that there's stock
7	trout.
8	MR. COSDEN: Yes, the
9	SERGEANT ALBERT: to it.
10	MR. COSDEN: More then likely. We did some pre-
11	season do you know when that occurred?
12	SERGEANT: A it was in December, early December.
13	MR. COSDEN: Early December. Okay.
14	MR. GRACIE: Any more questions? Thank you, Don.
15	Don, I like the monthly report. It would be great if we
16	could get it a week before the meeting.
17	MR. COSDEN: Okay. We'll try and do that. Bump it
18	up a little bit so that it doesn't have to be on the calendar
19	period. We can make it fit to your schedule.
20	River Herring Management
21	by Bob Sadzinski, MD DNR Fisheries Services
22	MR. SADZINSKI: I am Bob Sadzinski, Maryland DNR
23	Fisheries. I assume you are all can hear me back there. But
24	I would like to introduce Tony Jarzynski, who heads up all
25	the field work statewide. And we'll be talking about river

herring. And that's not it. Here you go. Tell them Bob 2 said hi. 3 MR. GRACIE: This one here? 4 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes, probably. The next slide. 5 (Slide) 6 So this presentation will be defining the problem. 7 You will see a bunch of data. Characterizing riverhead 8 fishery and what the present management options are. 9 going to be quick. 10 (Slide) 11 What the problem is. ASMFC has just passed 12 Amendment II, we call it the River Head Amendment. So the 13 Shad Amendment, which is Amendment III, is also just passed. 14 So -- but with the passing of Amendment II, which addresses 15 river herring problems throughout the East Coast, now we have 16 the right of sustainability plan by -- or by basically have 17 our fishery closed by 2012. Go ahead. 18 (Slide) And we all asked -- what we call SF or SFP or what 19 20 ever sustainable fisheries, is a fishery that could support a 21 commercial or recreational fishery, did not --- potential 22 future stock, reproduction and recruitment. So I didn't do 23 that definition. That's a copy and paste from ASMFC. 24 (Slide) 25 The responsibility form the river herring

management in the state, that river herring are an integral part of the Chesapeake Bay. Presently an abundance in Maryland is that record low levels and you will see that in a minute because river herring are a --- species. They do not --- for river herring management in Maryland. Now are charge is to conserve, protect and enhance our State's fisheries resources.

(Slide)

But what we're hearing our collective name for ailwife and blueback and you will see a picture here of them side by side, those two species. Being --- they spend most of their life in the ocean. But they need fresh water in order to spawn, that's why they come back every spring. Typically we see them between two and five years old and they may spawn up to five times.

(Slide)

So, here they are. The top one is funny looking blueback up by the stream. So -- side by side you can actually tell the difference. Sometimes when you catch them in you net you look at and go, what is this thing. I mean is it a ailwife blueback. Usually the ailwife are on the bottom. A little bit wider. The cockles are a little bit wider, the eyes are a little bit bigger. But ID class is a different time so --

(Slide)

Here is a river herring. This is shad roe. I couldn't find herring, okay, I tried. So shad roe, but it still smells and pops just like the real stuff. But a -- it really a rule mark at the commercial fishery. They get about \$28.00 per gallon, and a bushel roughly is about \$9.00. Works out to be about twenty cents a pound, about 10 cents each roughly, the average market.

The live liner the other night said he gets about \$2.00 each for live river herring. And for the dead bodies they use all kinds of stuff, crab, pots and Omega 3 oils that we all really like as we get older.

(Slide)

Recreational river herring, called hook and line.

Mostly is bycatchers. A few of us that target them, I used to target them with the maps, so you catch a few. Mostly you see them using dip nets, cast nets to catch them also. You pickle them, smoke them, fry them. So I use it for bait for catfish. But of course you always live line for striped bass.

(Slide)

Recreational regs. Pretty easy, hook and eyes, --tidal, non-tidal, dip nets are a live non-tidal --- only and
there are river specific regulations also, which I won't go
into. This is just a couple of examples.

(Slide)

Commercial regs are pretty simple. It's open January through June. Generally there is no gear restrictions.

(Slide)

If you have questions as I am going through, I am going to get into a lot of data here all of a sudden so if you have questions. I am going to see -- the scale is in millions of pounds, that's 40 million pounds, 50 million, 60 millions pounds, that's close by here in river herring landings.

Pretty significant in the old days. The old days weren't that long ago. The sixties, early seventies, 60, 70 million pounds landed on average. Really there is a bycatch fishery that occurs out there. There was a trawl fishery, the Russian fleet went in there and caught a whole lot of fish. And that's a whole separate presentation, I have that.

But you can see basically this is all the trend. The tend goes down basically in 1972, 1974. Of course 1972 was Agnes. Really has bottomed out. Has not come back since.

I should note that Tony and his crew really collected a lot of data. But we have only been collecting it probably since about 1980, so are already collecting it after this so-called crash has occurred. Go ahead.

(Slide)

 $\label{eq:As far as Maryland river herring landings, I know I \\$  am in your way the whole thing.

MR. GRACIE: That's fine.

MR. SADZINSKI: So a lifelong time series. It shows you the same trend as coast -- I mean -- caught six million pounds, eight million pounds there for a while. And then all of a sudden the bottom just dropped out. As I said a lot of our data, a lot of our data is really collected right here after the crash. So we have kind of contracted ages and like I said -- but I won't go into details and biological data.

(Slide)

So, what I did is I went to our database, and I started pulling out different things that might of interest. This particular graph shows the number of rivers reported by years. So in 1980 there was approximately 40 river systems that had reported river herring landings. So -- and so I tracked that over time for a year and you can see right now it averages right around 10 to 11. So basically there are fewer river herring and fewer river systems. That's what the graph is telling you.

(Slide)

Juvenile indices which do not track -- abundance, which I thought was kind of odd. But abundance was kind of

high in the fifties and sixties, but we still got -- we got the one spike the one year but in general we -- what the take away message, and this is for ailwife, is that we can still get a strong year classes even at these low abundances.

(Slide)

And here is the same graph for bluebacks. Which is the same thing. We even at the low abundance basically you will see every now and then we get a really strong year class. Basically saying it's environmentally driven now. If the conditions are just right, we get average flows, not low flows, not high flow, but decent flows. We have a potential of creating a strong year class.

(Slide)

And so then I started pulling about -- different gear types. The four major gear types used to catch river herring are cast nets, spike nets, pound nets, gill nets. And this is the number of watermen that report like using those types of years over 2006 to 2009. So it's the average.

So there are two people reporting from cast nets, four from spikes, nine from pound nets and 14 for gill.

MR. GRACIE: Are these targeted fisheries or are these bypass?

MR. SADZINSKI: This is everything. This is the whole database. So even if they only landed two pounds, it's

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

one. I count them as one.

MR. GRACIE: Were they are fishing for river 3 herring, or were they fishing for something else in that?

MR. SADZINSKI: We'll get to that, yes. It's hard to tell from this database --

MR. GRACIE: I got you.

MR. SADZINSKI: You'll see in a minute. It becomes a little bit more obvious.

(Slide)

The average annual and commercial landings by gear And this now is looking at the different gear types in the average landings per year. So if you look at cast nets all of a sudden, they're landing just over about 15,000 pounds per year. Yet, the other graph, there is only two people.

So then gill net, here's about 11,000 pounds per year. So, here between these two it averages 84 percent of landings come from cast nets or gill nets which list out, which I feel are targeted fishery.

Of course there are some overlaps, of course there's some guys fishing for white perch, two and a half to two and three quarters inch stretch mess. And you get part of the systems. They may be targeting white perch. I have spoke with a few of the guys and most of them are targeting -- the few I spoke to, especially on the Nanticoke are

targeting herring. 2 (Slide) 3 So, then I said okay, well, let's look at the 4 landings divided by the number of watermen using that gear 5 type. So I took the 15,000 pounds divided by the two people using cast nets, and average about 8,000 pounds. So then all 6 7 of a sudden it becomes really obvious that the people using cast nets are really hammering the fish. And the other --8 9 this one -- surprising was this one here, per watermen, which 10 I think there were 14 gill netters. Those hit the amount of pounds they land is not a whole lot. 11 12 (Slide) 13 So, then I kind of pulled up some river systems. 14 This is the generally river systems landings. And if you 15 look a the Northeast Susquehanna River, that's where most 16 of the landings come from. Followed by the Nanticoke. 17 Atlantic Ocean has trawl fisheries, small gear and ---18 fishery. So --19 (Slide) 20 The cause of river herring declines, I mean direct 21 harvest or course. Is that bycatch in the ocean and the Bay. Predation from either other fish, such as striped bass or 22 23 water fowl, water quality, dam construction and habitat. 24 (Slide) 25 As far as the time line here in Maryland, DNR

decided upon a option, we write their SFP plan, it needs to be written by 1 July. Which is this year, 1 July. And then the regulation will take effect roughly in 2012.

(Slide)

Those states already have submitted a plan, including Maine, New Hampshire, D.C., North Carolina and South Carolina. And these are the options they presented. Basically they're all closing or reducing harvest.

(Slide)

And as far as the commercial options, these are the options that we have come up with to present. And this is what we would like to some feedback on now. As far as commercial options. There is a moratorium, which is basically the full closure of the fishery. There are two limited direct or limited bycatch. And these need to be approved by ASMFC.

So it's not a slam dunk which is important to know, that these plans have to go before ASMFC tech committee to be reviewed. I sit on that committee. We send out -- a nod or we actually review these plans. And then we pass it on to the board and the board makes the final decision.

(Slide)

And then the next slide is a recreational options, which are very similar to --- moratorium or some sort of limited harvest. Which includes three other, or limitations.

(301)577-5882

So, if you can go -- maybe just leave those last two slides up. So -- yes, go ahead.

## Questions and Answers

MR. O'CONNELL: I just wanted to add a little bit to Bob, as well -- you know, while typically we like to provide, you now, conservation equivalent options, like you can have these season size limits, you know, these -- this is a little bit different. You know, we have a very depleted resource and we have to come up with the plan that meets the sustainable fisheries requirements that demonstrates that even with the fishery occurring, the population will be allowed to grow and rebuild.

You know, moratorium in regards to the resources, that we would have to expend on this -- resource, would be the lowest. As we go in to try to allow -- directed or bycatch fisheries or commercial or -- our fisheries for recreational, it's going to require us to implement more expensive monitoring plans in order to satisfy the sustainable fisheries management plan requirement.

So, you know, there are trade offs with each and a -- you know, we're open to consider allowing a fishery to continue but recognize that it's going to take resources to demonstrate that to ASMFC if we're able to. It's going to be very difficult.

MR. H. SMITH: How many cast netters were --

1 MR. SADZINSKI: Two that reported to us. 2 MR. H. SMITH: Two. 3 MR. GAINES: Hey, Bob. 4 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes. 5 MR. GAINES: I didn't see what the estimated recreational harvest is. 6 7 MR. SADZINSKI: We don't have a good estimate at 8 all. 9 MR. GAINES: We don't know? 10 MR. SADZINSKI: No. I mean I hear --11 (All speaking at once) MR. GAINES: The other side of the coin is, what is 12 13 the impact of the state -- I know we have to ask MAFMC in 14 doing this, but what is that value? If I look at it, there 15 is only 29 people who are harvesting these fish. So if we 16 say a total moratorium, that is only effecting 29 people. 17 But what is the gain for the state? 18 MR. SADZINSKI: Two. 19 It's two. Like Benjamin or --MR. GRACIE: 20 So you are effectively really two but MR. GAINES: 21 I said 29. So I mean what is the gain for the state if we 22 have more river herring -- we make ASMFC happy, but what about the rest of the state. Does that mean the rockfish are 23 24 better or does that mean something else happened, or is there 25 some support there.

1 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes, in theory. 2 MR. H. SMITH: Well, I know what wave herring does. 3 That whole fishery now is dependant upon the weigh faring. 4 No herring, no fish. That is the fishery up there right now. 5 When the wave herring comes through you have stripers on the flats. No herring, it's the Dead Sea. 6 7 MR. GAINES: Understood. 8 MR. O'BRIEN: Is this fishery upon the flat, is it 9 -- is that the fishery that is basically used for bait? 10 During the trophy season, catch-and-release season? 11 MR. SADZINSKI: That is correct. Yes. 12 Mr. O'BRIEN: Okay. Well, that answers that. 13 question, did the Tidal Fish Commission take a stand on this 14 issue? 15 MR. GARY: They created an action item, Ed, to come back to the March 23rd meeting of the Tidal Fish 16 17 Commission, with a more detailed presentation by Bob on how 18 this fishery closure allowance of a directed fishery would impact those participants. They also wanted more biological 19 information. 20 21 MR. GRACIE: Dave. 22 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes, I have a few more slides. 23 MR. KEEHN: Not to interrupt, but all those slides 24 he added, that was the information we are looking for. 25 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes, right. Plus I have biological

minimize their bycatch.

data, yes. That's the two hour presentation though, so --2 MR. D. SMITH: We got a good idea of the total 3 catch of Maryland, commercial and recreational. As far as --4 East Coast wide thing, if you put a moratorium on that, would 5 that shift then the people targeting those to a different fishery, say Menhaden? 6 7 MR. SADZINSKI: Maybe, yes. 8 MR. D. SMITH: Okay. So then that --9 MR. SADZINSKI: Well, total East Coast wise -- is 10 about a million pounds per year now. Total state landings. 11 MR. D. SMITH: Okay. Okay. 12 MR. SADZINSKI: And that's actually -- it's 13 actually dropped a little bit, it probably will be about 14 700,000 pounds or, I am not sure. 15 MR. GRACIE: Tom. You had a comment? 16 MR. O'CONNELL: Something that, you know, we're 17 trying to take into consideration, as well as other states, 18 is that -- just maybe a couple of points. One is that 19 outside of the upper Bay fishery, seems to be more direct. 20 The other fisheries are more of a back-head fishery. And if 21 you implement a harvest moratorium it's likely that they are 22 going to bycatch mortality. 23 You know, in my mind, like what are the incentives 24 that you can provide to try to keep people -- get people to

And there is really not at this

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

point in time.

So, you know, one of the arguments that people make is that, you know, if you are not going allow these fish to be caught, it's going to be a waste. In my view there is still a benefit from throwing those discards overboard, something is going to consume them. They're probably in the ecosystem. But, you know, it is an issue that should be taken into consideration as to whether or not that's a good end use of that products, since there is going to be mortality associated.

Another point is that, you know, as we look at a bycatch fishery or a directed fishery, the directed fishery is getting \$2.00 a piece, did I see.

MR. SADZINSKI: For live ones.

MR. O'CONNELL: And the bycatch is getting ten cents --

> MR. SADZINSKI: Ten cents, yes.

MR. GRACIE: Ten cents.

MR. O'CONNELL: So you really got economic value if we're going to try and preserve one fishery and we may have some concerns about live lining with, you know, herring. economically at least it's that fishery that provides more of an economic return then the bycatch fishery.

MR. SIKORSKI: So two people.

MR. SADZINSKI:

25

up and down the coast.

I have a question. I don't see any 1 MR. GRACIE: 2 data that says if we reduce our harvest to zero that's going 3 to make a difference. I don't see any data that shows that 4 our harvest is impacting the population. Am I correct? 5 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes, you're correct. But you need to remember we have a crew of one that does the research 6 7 statewide. So we focus all our research into one river 8 system. 9 MR. GRACIE: So we can't manage it on a mortality 10 population basis because we don't have enough data? 11 MR. SADZINSKI: That's one problem. 12 MR. GRACIE: Yes. 13 MR. SADZINSKI: Correct. But it's important to 14 note, we have talked -- the House directing that. But the 15 fishery is here to spawn. And most of these fish are caught 16 pre-spawn. You see very few down rivers caught. So you are 17 catching the fish before they spawn, before they contribute. 18 So if they continue this, we're right on the edge. I call it the threshold. Right on that threshold right now. 19 20 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Well, the stocks go wider, but 21 historic low, right? 22 MR. SADZINSKI: Absolutely. 23 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: And that's why ASMFC is doing There must be several hundred individual stream runs 24

There might be a handful out of one

21

22

23

24

25

here or there, that actually has enough left in it to be able to sustain some kind of fishery. 2 3 MR. SADZINSKI: Maine does. 4 Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: And Maine does, yes. And so 5 that is why I asked if ASMFC decided okay, an individual state that might have one of those kinds of runs, it's just 6 7 going to be up to them to demonstrate through the technical 8 command that that's their circumstance. And if they can't, 9 will have to close it as part of that coast wide recovery 10 program. 11 MR. GRACIE: Yes, I guess where my question is 12 going is, what kind of information would we use to develop a 13 sustainable fisheries management plan. I don't see how you 14 can do that. 15 MR. SADZINSKI: Well, the examples -- the five or 16 six states that have already written have based it on 17 mortality rates, which we have probably one of the better 18 databases on the East Coast. 19 MR. GRACIE: Oh, okay.

MR. SADZINSKI: Mortality, relative abundance, landings, jewel indicies. Which we probably have the best data sets on the East Coast.

MR. GRACIE: Okay. All right.

MR. O'CONNELL: Another part of the Commission's deliberation of this type of approach is -- there is a --

correct me if I am wrong, but there is a significant offshore bycatch fishery with river herring. And, you know, one of the strategies of --- Fisheries Commission taken this type of approach, whether or not that can be utilized as leverage to get the count and the federal management, the Fisheries Management Councils to address that problem.

When this Amendment was passed the Commissioners did send a letter to the National Fisheries Service asking them to implement by emergency action the monitoring programs. They have responded by saying they don't consider this situation an emergency. And not move as fast as the Commission would have hoped.

They are implementing expanded monitoring programs, but not as quickly as we had hoped. And the Commission will continue to put pressure on them. But the argument is why should we be shutting down our fisheries, just like maybe a commercial fisherman in my state or anybody's, why should we be shutting our fishery down while there are still catch, bycatching off shore. It is outside our jurisdiction, but we're trying -- who ever, have that approach.

MR. SIKORSKI: Basically what commercial -- operation are you speaking about?

MR. O'CONNELL: In Maryland?

MR. SIKORSKI: Yes. Now the ones that account for all these bycatch off shore?

1 MR. O'CONNELL: Oh, there is the Atlantic herring, 2 Bob? 3 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes, it's a big ---. It began back 4 in about 1998, 1999. Also the trawls came in. They used 5 these paired or single trawl fisheries. And the bycatch has been netting about a million pounds per year. 6 7 problem is a million pounds out there is sub-adults. So 8 even though here they have half-pound, there it could be 9 quarter-pound or less. So the million pounds that we see is 10 a half million fish, but a million pounds out there could be 11 five million fish. 12 So, a lot of us have been pushing, look, you need 13 to do something about this. So they're collecting more data. 14 It's real sparse. When they hit them, they hit a lot. 15 They're schooling species of course. So when you see one, 16 you will see a thousand. So when you try and expand that you 17 can't take one point estimate and multiply it by the number 18 of trawlers, it just doesn't work. 19 MR. SIKORSKI: And they're targeting herring? 20 MR. SADZINSKI: Atlantic herring. 21 MR. SIKORSKI: Atlantic herring. 22 MR. SADZINSKI: Yes. Which stocks are stable, the 23 latest assessment of that was. 24 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: And plus in that scenario, 25 aren't they mixed when they're off shore.

Ī.	0 /
1	MR. SADZINSKI: Yes.
2	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: So one run of the net could
3	effectively wipe out the run the run from a particular
4	stream.
5	MR. SADZINSKI: In theory. You're right.
6	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: I mean so, they might seem
7	abundant, you see a lot of them. But it could all that's
8	left
9	MR. SADZINSKI: Yes.
10	MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: over a particular run.
11	MR. SADZINSKI: Right.
12	MR. GRACIE: Does has the Department developed a
13	preference, where they want to go yet, or
14	MR. SADZINSKI: What do you mean
15	MR. GRACIE: you have some options that you
16	like.
17	MR. O'CONNELL: Well, I guess a couple of comments,
18	I guess, is as I stated earlier, the moratorium requires the
19	fewest resources to apply. Bob, correct me if I am wrong, I
20	think we estimated the dockside value of the commercial
21	fishery at about \$30,000.00?
22	MR. SADZINSKI: Correct.
23	MR. O'CONNELL: And, you know, if we had to go
24	forward with the sustainable management plan we may have to
25	implement requirements to have a permitting process, maybe

1 an establishment of an annual harvest target requiring monitoring. You know, our costs may be more significant 2 3 then the dockside value unless we required those 4 participating in the fishery to, you know, support the 5 monitoring program. So, you know, again, we're open to options 6 7 recognizing that, you know, if we are going to have to take 8 additional costs we may have to look at -- see if the 9 industry is willing to support those additional costs. 10 MR. GRACIE: I am going to come back to Ed O'Brien's question about, what the Tidal Fish Commission's 11 12 responses is, and you've agreed to make another presentation 13 to them? 14 MR. SADZINSKI: Correct. 15 MR. GRACIE: I don't know how the Commissioners 16 feel, but do we want and wait and see that? Do you want to 17 get some input for your constitutes, quota groups, before we 18 decide? What's the timing on this? Tom. 19 MR. O'CONNELL: Well, obviously if it was a 20 moratorium you could let us know probably on June 30. 21 MR. GRACIE: Well, it's a little bit late to 22 develop the --23 MR. O'CONNELL: Well, I would think that --24 MR. SADZINSKI: Well, this doesn't mean that I 25 could write it in 12 hours.

through 2014?

1 MR. O'CONNELL: In regards to looking at a 2 sustainable fisheries plan, I think we would be happy if we 3 could resolve some recommendations by the March meeting. 4 And that would give us a few months to put something 5 together. 6 MR. COBURN: If there's a moratorium, is a time 7 line on it, or is it indefinite. Until other ---. 8 MR. O'CONNELL: I think it would be dependant upon future stock assessments to demonstrate recovery and --9 10 MR. COBURN: So it would be a five, six, seven, eight year moratorium? Which is fine. I mean I am in 11 12 agreement with that, but I am just curious. 13 MR. SADZINSKI: You should know that ASMFC has 14 gone through river herring assessment right now. There is a 15 group by --- sub committee for river herring. And our time 16 line is 2014 to have that assessment done. We did present some familiar data to the board, while Amendment II was 17 18 going through Amendment II kind of speed write through the 19 board, which is kind of a miracle in itself, that it passes 20 as is. 21 But five states have already closed their directed 22 river herring fisheries, and we suspect more will. 23 MR. GRACIE: Does that mean that at the very least if we decide on a moratorium it will be a four year periods, 24

1 MR. SADZINSKI: No. 2 MR. GRACIE: No. 3 MR. SADZINSKI: I think it calls for an annual 4 You could actually submit -review. 5 MR. GRACIE: Oh, okay. 6 MR. SADZINSKI: -- every July we submit our 7 compliance report to ASMFC. And in that compliance report we 8 can request that a fishery or limited fishery be open or 9 actually to close it. We make changes basically, whatever we 10 recommend. 11 MR. GRACIE: Commissioners, any -- everybody satisfied with waiting until next month. Does somebody want 12 13 to make a motion. Richie. 14 MR. GAINES: No motion, but just want to make a 15 If we don't do something to recover the herring on 16 the flats, the stripe bass fishery will go away and there 17 won't be a market for that \$2.00 per fish fee. 18 MR. GRACIE: Ed. 19 MR. O'BRIEN: And I think that's the issue. 20 then the value of the catch itself, compared to DNR costs. I 21 mean I recognize it's important, you know, your budget, but 22 if this really is an important fishery, such as striped bass, 23 you know, that value has to be somehow recognized. 24 MR. GAINES: Well, the worst day on --- flats -- if

you are trying to catch striped bass. Everyday.

1 Right. Brian, you had a comment. MR. GRACIE: 2 Yes. I believe I made the motion of MR. KEEHN: 3 tidal fish, strictly from the standpoint that when Bob 4 presented it, he didn't have the number of how many people 5 benefit from the fishery. And the only I will say is that if I had known how few people participated and really basically 6 7 two people are catching the -- the big percentage, I would 8 have voted -- I wouldn't have even done the wait and see with 9 that data I see there. It's a nominal -- it's a small impact 10 that bares more people, but the return is great, as Richie 11 said, if those herrings are not on the flat, then the bass 12 aren't on the flat. So --13 But at the time that I made the motion, I wasn't 14 sure if we were effecting hundreds of people, you know, 15 that's the reason I made the motion. Just to let everybody 16 know. 17 MR. GRACIE: Tom O'Connell and Bill Goldsborough. 18 MR. O'CONNELL: Just to put it in the clear 19 prospective, Bob, you want to show the average harvest per 20 individual. That the gill net was 2,000 pounds. 21 MR. SADZINSKI: Roughly, yes. 22 MR. O'CONNELL: At 10 cents a piece, that's \$200.00 23 a year. 24 MR. GRACIE: Bill. 25 These -- those additional MR. GOLDSBOROUGH:

slides, Bob, is that -- does that constitute where you are 2 going to take the tidal fish down or is there more working 3 there? 4 MR. SADZINSKI: There is more. 5 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Okay. 6 MR. SADZINSKI: I have 59 slides I brought. 7 saw what, 14. I can -- I mean I have a lot of biological 8 data. I have infrastructure, I have mortality rates, I have 9 relative abundance indices, I have more pie charts. I mean 10 there is a whole bunch of stuff, yes. 11 MR. GRACIE: We're not going to do that tonight. 12 MR. SADZINSKI: No. No. I won't torture you. But 13 there's something in particular --14 MR. GRACIE: And then we're out of time on this for 15 the agenda. Does somebody -- does a Commissioner want to 16 make a motion on this? 17 MOTION 18 MR. COBURN: I make a motion, put a moratorium on 19 it. 20 Larry. We have a motion for a MR. GRACIE: 21 moratorium. To recommend a moratorium. 22 MR. GRACIE: Seconded by Herb. 23 MR. H. SMITH: Seconded by Herb Smith. 24 MR. GRACIE: Yes. All right. Discussion of the 25 Commissioners only for now. The public will get a

1	chance to speak before we vote. Any discussion?
2	(No response)
3	MR. GRACIE: Any comments from the public?
4	(No response)
5	MR. GRACIE: I will call a motion then. All in
6	favor say yea.
7	MR. GARY: Show of hands.
8	(Chorus of "ayes")
9	MR. GRACIE: Show of hands.
10	(Hands shown)
11	MR. GRACIE: Opposed? Any abstentions?
12	(No response)
13	MR. GRACIE: Unanimous.
14	MR. GARY: Pass is 10/0.
15	MR. GRACIE: 10/0. Thank you. Thanks, Bob.
16	Summer flounder, who is
17	Summer Flounder Management
18	by Carrie Kennedy, MD DNR Fisheries Services
19	MS. KENNEDY: Carrie Kennedy. I am a Coastal
20	Fisheries Program Manager for those of you who don't know me.
21	I have been working with the commercial striped bass fishery,
22	administrating that fishery. But about a year ago, I moved
23	over to the coast and that means that I get to wear the
24	summer flounder hat.
25	(Slide)

So I just have four brief slides that I want to go through today. But what I want to hear from you guys tonight is what your preferred option is for our summer flounder regulations for 2010. Marty, if you could go to the next slide.

(Slide)

I just want to give you guys a little background. We do have to take reductions in 2010 from what we had in 2009. That reduction is 23.6 percent.

Now, just a tiny little bit of background information, is that waves five and six so -- October -- September through December for the entire coast are not currently available. For summer flounder we add two weeks in September, that was still open, that is not available as part of our harvest estimate for 2009.

So what all states had to do as per the Atlantic
States Marine Fisheries Commission, Technical Committee, was
project what their harvest would have been based on what was
harvested in 2008. So, we had our harvest through the end of
August, and then we figured out what we harvested in 2008 in
a daily basis, in September and then we applied to daily rate
for those two weeks in September and that's how we came up to
23.6 percent.

It's not ideal. But we still do not have wave five and six data. If those wave five and six data come in,

they will likely be so suspect as the Technical Committee would not want to use them at all. And the reason why 2 3 they're suspect for waves five and six is that they only got 4 60 percent of their phone calls, of their target number of 5 phone calls that was to be --6 I have a question. Maybe I am the MR. GRACIE: 7 only one that doesn't understand the term you're using, 8 waves --9 MS. KENNEDY: Okay. 10 MR. GRACIE: -- five and six. 11 MS. KENNEDY: Okay. MR. GRACIE: Tell us what waves mean. 12 13 MS. KENNEDY: Again, wave is a two month period. 14 And when I am saying wave five and six I mean September 15 through December. 16 MR. GRACIE: Okay. 17 MS. KENNEDY: So wave five is September and 18 October, wave six is November and December. And it's MRFSS 19 sampling time frame. 20 MR. GRACIE: Thank you. 21 MS. KENNEDY: So MRFSS did not -- they only got 22 about 60 percent of their phone calls for September through 23 December. Which is why we have to use a projection. 24 projection leads us to 23.6 percent of a reduction for 2010.

The good news is that our target number of fish is

1	up in 2010. It was 61,000 pounds in 2009. We went up to
2	75,000 pounds, or 75,000 fish, sorry, not pounds, numbers of
3	fish.
4	MR. GRACIE: That's with the reduction?
5	MS. KENNEDY: That's with the reduction. So
6	MR. GRACIE: After the reduction you were allowed
7	75,000 fish.
8	MS. KENNEDY: Sorry. This is 75,000 fish is the
9	beginning, but because we harvested 89,000 fish or something
10	like that in 2009, to get down to 75,000 fish, we have to
11	harvest 23 percent, well, 23.6 percent less then we did. We
12	don't take it off the 75,000, we just have to cut how many
13	fish we harvest to get to 75,000. So
14	MR. SIKORSKI: They take last year's harvest.
15	MR. GRACIE: I don't understand.
16	MR. SIKORSKI: They take
17	MR. GRACIE: I am lost.
18	MR. GARY: They take last years harvest.
19	MR. SIKORSKI: They take last years take.
20	MS. KENNEDY: Right.
21	MR. SIKORSKI: And reduce it by 23.6 and they end
22	up with 75,000.
23	MS. KENNEDY: Right.
24	MR. GAINES: But it says 61,000 in 2009.
25	MS. KENNEDY: Right.

1 MR. SIKORSKI: That was the target. 2 MR. GAINES: Oh, that was the target. 3 MS. KENNEDY: That's what our target --4 MR. GAINES: Oh, okay. Got you. 5 (Simultaneous discussion.) 6 MS. KENNEDY: And again, you know, let me point out 7 that what we get from our harvest estimates and while we 8 certainly have concerns about what our harvest estimates are, 9 it is the process that we have, it is -- they are the best 10 available data. 11 So, you have to take this reduction in 2010. 12 will be -- that means we're going to be increasing the size 13 limit for 2010. But because we're increasing the size limit, 14 we're going to be able to increase the season and increase 15 the number of dates. So if you could go to the next slide. 16 (Slide) 17 MR. GRACIE: Did you have a question, Ed? 18 MR. O'BRIEN: I just wondered if going in for everybody here might be good to mention the size limits 19 20 first. 21 MS. KENNEDY: What -- I would like to actually get 22 to my next point and then we get to the size limits and we're 23 done. 24 So, typically, since 2005, we have submitted the 25 option to Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission for a

split season. So the Chesapeake Bay was 16.5 inches, one fish, and the Coastal Bays was 18 inches, three fish. That was for 2008. But each year since 2005, we've had that split.

(Slide)

So, again, this year we propose that split along with some other minimum state sizes, statewide. And Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Board, did not approve that split. Now, the Technical Committee reviewed our option first and recommended to the Board not to approve that split option.

So specifically what the Technical Committee said was that they do not approve the adoption of Option I, which was again was the split area size limits because the sample sizes and date available are insufficient to evaluate regulations with area splits.

So, based on the way that MRFSS does it's sampling, we can't evaluate how effective our regulations are with that split. So --

MR. GRACIE: Does that mean that if you lump it all together you got a bigger number so you have a better estimate.

MS. KENNEDY: That's what it means. So they did not approve that. What that leads us to is that -- this year there will be one minimum state size for summer flounder.

1 That's what we're going to get to next. That's what I need 2 your input on. 3 MR. O'CONNELL: Hey, Carrie. 4 MS. KENNEDY: Yes. 5 MR. O'CONNELL: May I missed it, but did you clarify the last point. 6 7 MS. KENNEDY: No, I didn't, actually if you could 8 And the last point and part of the reason why ASMFC 9 did not approve our option with split minimum size is that 10 since 2007, for the last three years, we have failed to meet or stay below our summer flounder target, based on those 11 12 harvest estimates. 13 So, we have these regulations, we institute them, 14 we have the split area size, and every year since 2007 we 15 have been going over our target. And we can't know what's 16 effective because we don't have enough data. And there's no 17 way to evaluate what part of the regulations are effective. 18 MR. COBURN: Is this recreational? 19 MS. KENNEDY: This is recreational. 20 MR. GRACIE: Oh, yeah. 21 MR. O'CONNELL: And Carrie, how does that 22 performance compare to other sates? MS. KENNEDY: For 2009, actually, we are one of 23 24 three states that went over our target. New Jersey went over 25 by less then one percent, Delaware went over by three percent

and we went over by 23.6 percent. And the only other state that has a split area is North Carolina and they have not been going over.

(Slide)

So, moving on. These are our options. All of our options here are really in response to what we heard from the public in January. We had a meeting down at the Prince Frederick Public Library, with some recreational folks down there. And then we had a meeting over on the coast.

You'll see that we have two start dates in April.

All of our start dates are on Saturdays, again in response to comments that we heard. Some folks wanted to start middle of April, some folks preferred to start at the end. But this was as early as we could get. And the various ending dates with those early dates. This gives us all 24.5 percent reduction.

Now, we also heard from folks in both meetings that they like to go as late in the year as possible. So we started at the end and worked backwards, to see -- okay, so if you want to go as late as October 30<sup>th</sup>, where does that leave you in the start date. So we have a couple of those options.

And then our final option -- this is wrong. All of these are three fish, 18.5 inches. This one should be

_	
1	19 inches. That's why we got such a long season here.
2	That's why it goes April $17^{\rm th}$ to November $2^{\rm nd}$ . And again, that
3	was a request that we heard through public comment, that if
4	we went up to 19 inches, could they be out there fishing
5	longer. So, yes, that's an option. All of these give us the
6	same percentage reduction.
7	MR. GRACIE: Why is that June $8^{\text{th}}$ to October $30^{\text{th}}$ the
8	same? That's the shortest season up there.
9	MS. KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Because a day in
10	October does not equal a day in May or April. The harvest
11	rate in September and October is much higher, that's why you
12	guys all want to fish in October, because you have a greater
13	chance of catching a summer flounder.
14	MR. GRACIE: That's why there ought to be
15	12 October.
16	MS. KENNEDY: So, we can go a little longer in
17	October but that makes the season shorter.
18	MR. GRACIE: Thank you.
19	MS. KENNEDY: So preferences? Concerns?
20	Questions?
21	Questions and Answers
22	MR. COBURN: I think, five is a good one, because
23	I've actually had people come up to me and prefer that.
24	MS. KENNEDY: Okay.
25	MR. COBURN: Today, matter of fact.

•	82
1	MS. KENNEDY: Okay.
2	MR. COBURN: They would like to see that. It is
3	something that I've heard.
4	MR. O'CONNELL: Which one, Larry?
5	MR. COBURN: Five.
6	MR. GRACIE: Ed.
7	MR. O'BRIEN: Just a couple of quick things. What
8	when you have these hearings, how many people attended the
9	hearings?
10	MS. KENNEDY: At the meeting on the Coast we had
11	close to 100, if not more.
12	MR. O'BRIEN: Significant turn out on the Coast.
13	MS. KENNEDY: Yes, significant turn out.
14	MR. O'BRIEN: How about the Bay?
15	MS. KENNEDY: And the one down in Southern Maryland
16	we had three people.
17	MR. O'BRIEN: Three people. Okay. First of all,
18	I think I am lost on this one, but you know, I've never
19	seen the Technical Committee approve a split situation when
20	it came to Maryland Bay versus ocean. I remember striped
21	bass when we went down to the conservation equivalency,
22	18 inches, when really it's 20 inches. And we got 18 inches
23	conservation equivalency. That seemed to be a real
24	breakthrough when it came to the term conservation
25	equivalency. A precedent, if you will. And that's something
<u>I</u>	

that Maryland achieved. 2 Now, later on as we learned from that we got 3 conservation equivalency on flounder. Because typically last 4 year was an anomaly, I don't know. But I know it was 5 evidently significantly different then previous years when we had small flounder in the Bay compared to what was in the 6 7 ocean. 8 Now, I've heard data doesn't support that. 9 my only data is, you know, a dock with 30 charter boats, 10 where if you see five keepers come in, in a month, that was 11 extraordinary. 12 So I think we make a mistake if we just abandon the 13 conservation equivalency. I don't know what the penalty 14 would be. Again, I know last year there were some nice 15 flounder caught down south in particular. 16 MS. KENNEDY: Well, let me just add -- correct you 17 on one point, we actually have had split seasons approved by 18 the Technical Committee for summer flounder from 2005 through 2009. 19 20 MR. O'BRIEN: Oh, I know that. 21 MS. KENNEDY: Right. 22 But I am saying once you give that MR. O'BRIEN: 23 up, when are you going to get it back. 24 MS. KENNEDY: I see.

MR. O'CONNELL: It's my understanding -- I mean

25

1 conservation equivalency is still available to us but because of the lack of data and our poor performance, the Technical 2 3 Committee didn't recommend it and the Board didn't approve 4 it. 5 MS. KENNEDY: Right. 6 MR. O'CONNELL: You know, so perhaps with 7 implementation and with the new recreational monitoring 8 survey or investment on our end, you know, we can go back to 9 something like that. 10 MS. KENNEDY: Certainly. If there were a different -- if we had a higher number of samples in the coastal bays 11 12 and a higher number of samples in the Chesapeake Bay, and we 13 could differentiate between the two, that would be a whole 14 different story, and we might be able to go back to that 15 then. 16 MR. GRACIE: What is your timing on your desire for 17 recommendation from the Commission? 18 MS. KENNEDY: We would like a recommendation from 19 the Commission this evening. 20 MR. O'CONNELL: We can -- can we implement this by 21 public notice, correct? 22 MS. KENNEDY: We can implement this by public 23 notice. We anticipate that once we have the comment from

meeting in Salisbury on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, once we have both those --

this Commission tonight and then there's another public

have heard all that public comment, we'll go back and make a decision. The earliest that we would submit regulations and a public notice could be March 5<sup>th</sup>.

Our play end is to submit a public notice and permanent regulations at the same time. The reason why we

regulations, they would be effective by the start date.

Unless -- there actually no start dates -- the permanent regulations would be effective.

would do that is because if we just submitted permanent

And we do have authority to modify the season and creel and size limits by public notice. So we would submit both of those at the earliest convenience, the earliest time we could do that would be March  $5^{\rm th}$ . We need to do that sooner rather then later.

MR. GRACIE: Commissioners have a preference here? Somebody want to make a motion?

## MOTION

MR. COBURN: I motion to help them fine.

MR. D. SMITH: Can I make a comment?

MR. GRACIE: We have a motion now --

MR. D. SMITH: Okay.

MR. GRACIE: -- and let's see if we have a second. If we don't have a second, it will die for want of a second. Goes first.

MR. D. SMITH: Okay.

FIR. D. SHI

1 Let me get the motion. MR. GRACIE: 2 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: I will second. 3 MR. GRACIE: Bill second. 4 MR. H. SMITH: How long is the season. That is --5 I think it benefits both MR. D. SMITH: recreational because they can be out on the water longer, 6 7 economically then if it -- more time to spend money -- 18.5 8 to 19, I don't know how big a deal that is, but -- I guess 9 for a lot of people like us who have been fishing for a long 10 time, maybe not me, but -- get out on the water and they're 11 pretty happy with just getting out on the water. They might 12 not catch a fish but they're happy being out there. 13 maybe somebody coming along that's new at it, probably won't 14 be doing it too much if they're not catching legal fish. 15 I guess that was my thought process on that. That half inch. 16 But we are up for Option 4 or 5. So --17 MR. GRACIE: Richard. 18 If I could just hear that half inch is MR. GAINES: 19 a big deal. I am really good at catching flounder. And from 20 18.5 to 19 inches is a big deal. 21 The other thing that I want to point out is, and 22 you guys can correct me, probably 75 percent of flounder you 23 catch are deep hooked. So how many are we killing to get to 24 19 inches, okay. So I think there's a place where it levels 25 out, when you get to those upper size limits, you're killing

a hell of a lot of fish to get there to catch that one. To 2 think that we're doing the right thing. 3 So, I would encourage you guys to stay with 4 something at 18.5 inches. Because I can tell you the average 5 person struggles to catch them that big and there's a big 6 jump between 18.5 and 19. 7 Matt fishes a different part of the Bay, I mean he 8 may be able to add something, too. I fish off Popular 9 Island, and that way. You can catch them, but you got to go 10 through 15 or 20 of them to get an 18.5. 11 So you're talking about --MR. COBURN: 12 MR. GAINES: No, they said Option 5. 13 Is at 19. Anything that is 18.5 --MR. GRACIE: 14 and I would ask the charter boat guys what works for them. Ι 15 know that in this part, in the middle part of the Bay, we don't even see fish until around the first week of June. But 16 the buys that fish the lower part of the Bay, I don't know 17 18 when they start seeing flounder --19 MR. WOMMACK: Around May. 20 MR. GAINES: Around May. So, you know, Option 4 21 would work probably for everything. 22 MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, that's what I was thinking, 23 too. 24 MR. GAINES: Except the -- yes, you got to figure

out the coastals, it's a whole other world. Again, talking

about two different sizes, those guys see fish probably 2 And bigger. earlier. 3 MR. GRACIE: Any other comments from the 4 Commissioners on the motion? 5 (No response) MR. GRACIE: Comments from the public? Somebody 6 7 had their hand up. 8 **Public Comments** 9 MR. JONES: Yes, I was just --10 MR. GARY: You need to come up. 11 MR. GRACIE: And your name. And we need to get you 12 to the microphone since we are recording. 13 MR. JONES: My name is Eddie Jones, basically been recreational flounder fishing in the Bay and in the coast for 14 15 about 15 to 20 years. I average about 40 days a year on the 16 combined. I can use some of my personal data. It's been 17 about a 10 to 1 ratio on keepers to throwbacks at Virginal, 18 let's say, 19 inches which is what Virginia had last year. 19 MR. GRACIE: You mean throwbacks to keepers? 20 MR. JONES: Correct. MR. GRACIE: Ten keepers for one throwback? 21 22 MR. JONES: No, sir. The other way. 23 MR. GRACIE: The other way around. 24 MR. JONES: The other way. 25 I was going to say I want to fishing MR. GRACIE:

with you.

MR. JONES: No, no, no. No, no, no. And this year in the Bay and I am basically speaking about mid-Bay here when I am talking about Bay, Popular Island and areas that were already mentioned, it was very easy to go catch your one fish this year. You were allowed one fish and it was 16.5 inches.

Quite honestly, if you got the tide right and the drift right, and you had four people, could be done in 20 minutes. Okay. It was good, it was right. Things were right.

I am all for and all of my buddies, we've all talked about it, we think 19 is a little bit extreme. Half an inch doesn't make a very huge big deal. But again, in most of the Bay you don't see a fish until June 1 of any kind of numbers, you might catch one or two and then that's for something, but -- my people are all lobbying towards 18.5 inches, longest season we can get, kind of justifying it from June 1 on.

MR. GRACIE: So that would be Option 3 then, right?

MR. JONES: Option 3 or 4. I would be fine with

either one of those in our opinions. Now, unfortunately I do

think -- I do fish on the coast in Ocean City, we have a

condo over there, it's going to hurt their early season.

There are some fish that do show up in Ocean City, the bigger

fish, that there is a target up there, probably starting

April 20<sup>th</sup> thereabouts and on. So there is going to be -- you are going to get some yakking about that for sure.

MR. GRACIE: Carrie, have you talked to those people? Do you have a feel for what the might prefer?

MS. KENNEDY: I have got a ton of e-mails that all support the 19 inch option. When we went and spoke to them in January, when they suggested the 19 inch minimum, you know, it was sort of split between a contingent that wanted a little earlier and a contingent that wanted a little later. But what I've heard, you know, via e-mail traffic is largely 19 inches.

MR. SIKORSKI: What number does ASMFC use for -- like catch-and-release mortality for flounder? Do they have any data on that?

MS. KENNEDY: You know, I don't know that number off the tip of head. But it's part of the consideration in the Technical Committee deliberations, when they come up with the calculations that, you know, let us get to these numbers.

MR. GRACIE: Tom.

MR. O'CONNELL: Hi, Carrie. I am just trying to minimize the chance that we're likely to have two different options from sport fish and the Coastal Fishery Advisory Committee.

If Option 5 is not selected do -- do you have any idea of which the Coastal Committee would prefer? Would it be earlier or later or is it pretty much split, which I think it might be.

MS. KENNEDY: My sense is that it was pretty split. I mean Mike could probably, you know, confirm that. But their conversation at the meeting that we brought it to was pretty split. You know, half of them wanted it earlier and half of them wanted it later.

MR. GRACIE: Any other comments from Commissioners?

Public? Go ahead. Identify yourself.

MR. KRISTY: Thank you. My name is Robert Kristy.

And I will probably be a devil's advocate here for Ocean

City. I will start out by saying I probably fished one or

two days in the past five years for flounder so I really

don't have a dog in this hunt. But I have been to Ocean City

quite a bit. And while we're up here fishing for rock, what

the things that they're down there doing is gearing up for

flounder.

And it goes against every grain in body to put a dollar sign on a fish. But they're going to want that holiday. Especially because that's when everybody -- you guys know Route 50, it's packed up. They're going down there. They're going fishing. At least they want the opportunity to catch a fish.

1 MR. GRACIE: You talking about what holiday, 2 Memorial Day? 3 MR. KRISTY: Yes. 4 MR. GRACIE: Yes. 5 That's for -- in May. So with that --MR. KRISTY: with that in mind, you know, you're really --6 7 MR. GRACIE: One, two and four. 8 MR. KRISTY: Right. 9 MR. GRACIE: We get that. 10 MR. KRISTY: One, two, four, five. And with that 11 being said the coastal fishery is the bread and butter of 12 flounder fishery. I don't think anybody would really argue. 13 We do have people here are very good at targeting flounder in the Bay. It's a very exciting fishery if you can get on them 14 15 But the majority of flounder are targeted, in my in the Bay. 16 opinion, at Ocean City and the surrounding area. 17 So, when we sit here and talk about ourselves we 18 have to realize that you know, they're dictating striped bass 19 to us, will be a little upset. But flounders, they're 20 fisheries, so I would give them the lion's share of the 21 opportunity to get out and do what they do best. 22 Thank you. Was there somebody else MR. GRACIE: 23 who wanted to speak from the public? Go ahead. Come up and 24 identify yourself. 25 MR. PHOEBUS: My name is Bill Phoebus.

the one at 16 inches.

in Annapolis but I also fish a lot in Ocean City. And I had 2 a couple of questions. One, the last, in three years, we've 3 been over our limit, right? 4 MS. KENNEDY: Yes. 5 MR. PHOEBUS: What did -- what did you do differently this year so that we wouldn't be over next year? 6 7 MS. KENNEDY: Well, the first thing that we did, 8 the main thing that we did is we made a minimum -- a minimum 9 statewide size rather then having area split. And then that 10 means for the Chesapeake Bay we went up two inches to 18.5, 11 if that's what the final decision is. And then -- on the 12 coast it's up by half an inch. 13 MR. PHOEBUS: Does that mean that you think most people are going to catch three fish that are 18.5 on the 14 15 coast or catch three fish --16 MS. KENNEDY: You know --17 MR. PHOEBUS: -- on the Chesapeake Bay. 18 MS. KENNEDY: -- it's actually -- the calculations 19 are not based on what we think people are going to catch. 20 It's based on some reduction tables and some calculations 21 that Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission that does 22 that says, if you catch one fish, you know, at 16 inches, you get this reduction, and if you catch three fish at 18.5 23 24 inches you get this reduction, which is more significant then

1 MR. PHOEBUS: If you were to lower the number of fish to two fish would that bring your total reduction down? 2 3 It's less then a third of a percent. MS. KENNEDY: 4 MR. PHOEBUS: So even though you would be reducing 5 by 33 percent it would be less then a third of a percent in 6 reduction. 7 MS. KENNEDY: Is what the reduction would get us. 8 Right. 9 MR. GRACIE: What that means is not many people are 10 catching three fish. 11 MS. KENNEDY: Right. 12 MR. PHOEBUS: So, I guess I was wondering what 13 point is -- is people aren't -- if people aren't going to 14 catch, they're going to be lucky to catch, early on they're 15 going to catch one, maybe two, and as that season goes on, 16 those head boats are going to come in with nobody having a 17 fish on that boat. 18 I talked to you today, as a matter of fact --19 MS. KENNEDY: Yes. 20 MR. PHOEBUS: Why did you have to come to the 18.5 21 inches, 18.5 and couldn't you have come to a small fish but 22 at least giving them one fish. So that when they came in at 23 least the captain could say well, we had five people limited 24 out today out of 40. You know, I am thinking about charter 25 boat captains and that business down there, too, because they

are not -- and you get all those people on a boat, you get a big bycatch. And I think the bycatch is very important.

You're killing a lot of fish.

Every time you raise that up, you kill more fish because they got to go back over. I don't know about seven out of 10 fish dying. But I can tell you a lot of flounder die because they're to handled correctly or they are deep hooked.

And my feeling was if you let them have a smaller fish and limit them to one or two, you know, I just didn't know why you came up with that 18.5. And I know Virginia is at 19 and they catch a few fish early spring, but then after that, those big fish are gone. And they're back to a smaller fish. And that, really that kind of fishery peters out after a while.

MS. KENNEDY: Well, let me -- you know, I don't have that table in my brain. But I can tell you that a 16 inch fish but one is going -- might be something like that would give us a five percent reduction, whereas you know, the table that we're given to do these calculations, to get to our reduction, you know, with those states 18.5 inches, three fish, we end up with this 24.5 reduction.

So -- a smaller fish, one fish, might be a five percent reduction, a bigger fish, three fish, is going to be a larger reduction.

1	MR. PHOEBUS: I do remember previous
2	MS. KENNEDY: We need to get we need to you
3	know, our reduction is 24 percent.
4	MR. PHOEBUS: Right.
5	MS. KENNEDY: So, we're already, you know, pretty
6	close to what our reduction has to be.
7	MR. GRACIE: We're going to have to move on.
8	MR. PHOEBUS: Okay.
9	MR. GRACIE: You have anything else to say?
10	MR. PHOEBUS: I have a lot to say but we don't have
11	enough of time.
12	MR. GRACIE: We never do, sorry. Thank you.
13	MR. PHOEBUS: Okay.
14	MR. SIKORSKI: I would say, Carrie if I may,
15	Jim?
16	MR. GRACIE: Go ahead.
17	MR. SIKORSKI: On that point. Is it part of the
18	answer to his question about why we can't have a smaller
19	fish, because that mean you would have to have a much smaller
20	season?
21	MS. KENNEDY: Yes, a much smaller season. And a
22	there is just more smaller fish available.
23	MR. LAWRENCE: I just have one quick point. My
24	name is Matt Lawrence. As we over the years have come down
25	to this, the regulation that we currently have, this started

off with more fish and got down to three. Three fish is what the coastal fisheries, the head boat captains, that's about -- that's the least amount of fish that they feel that they could still get clients to come on their boat. That was an important consideration.

To go down and pay, I don't know what they charged, \$30.00, \$40.00, \$50.00 to go out for the day and just have one flounder possibly, the potential for that wasn't enough. So that's why we're set at three for the last few years.

MR. GRACIE: Thank you, Mike. Now, we have a motion on the floor. Any other discussion. We only called the question only once. Dave Sikorski. You have something you have to say, go ahead.

MR. SIKORSKI: No.

MR. GRACIE: Oh, Bill Goldsborough.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Yes. My question had to do with the gut hooking, I guess for Richie. When the three quarters that you say caught, was that last year or --

MR. GAINES: No, that's over a long period of time. When your dragging baits, three-fourths of the fish -- I said 70 percent are deep hooked. To where it's really a struggle to get that hook out of them. You are ripping and tearing.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: Well, wouldn't the point be how much that ratio goes up with a higher minimum size.

1 MR. GAINES: That was the point I was making. 2 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: But that is what I was trying to 3 get out, you know, how much -- well, last year with 16.5 in 4 the Bay versus what it would be if it were say 18.5 or 19. Ι 5 mean does it go up that much? 6 MR. GRACIE: I don't think that's the question 7 we're going to be able to answer tonight, Bill. So I am not 8 sure that's helpful. I mean does somebody have those 9 numbers? 10 (No response) 11 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: I guess my point was at 18.5 it 12 would still be quite high. Follow me. 13 MR. COBURN: They have --14 MR. SIKORSKI: When was the season shut down last 15 year? I believe it was in September? MS. KENNEDY: September 13<sup>th</sup>. 16 17 MR. SIKORSKI: Okay. I just -- one thing I saw in 18 an issue back -- when it was shut down, and I saw a major 19 outcry to the fact that that's -- the time of the year when 20 the weather is still good and people are still fishing. 21 that's recreational anglers going to Ocean City, that's 22 charter boats being able to go out and take anglers out 23 fishing. 24 MS. KENNEDY: Right. 25 MR. SIKORSKI: And so if you give -- to me Option 5

makes sense because we have a longer time period on the calendar to allow for the economic activity, line fishing, to 2 3 take place. And you know, unfortunately, it does mean an 4 increase in size. And --5 MR. GRACIE: Okay. I am going to call the question. We're way over here. All in favor of the motion 6 7 say yea. 8 (Chorus of "ayes") 9 MR. GRACIE: Raise your hands, raise your hands. 10 MR. GARY: We have one, two, three, four. 11 MR. GRACIE: Opposed? 12 (Show of hands) 13 MR. GARY: One, two, three, four, five, six. 14 MR. GRACIE: Motion fails. If we could limit the 15 discussion I am willing to entertain another motion. We need 16 to make a recommendation to the fishery folks. Can we have 17 the options back up there, please, Marty. 18 MR. WOMMACK: Is that the best we got to choose 19 from? 20 MR. GRACIE: That's it. Those are our choices. 21 Afraid so, Mack. 22 MR. WOMMACK: I mean people ain't going to play 23 fair. 24 MR. GRACIE: No, it doesn't mean our reduction 25 She's already answered that.

	100
1	MR. GARY: These are the only options that are
2	available because ASMFC gave it to us and they approved this
3	list.
4	MR. GRACIE: Roger.
5	MR. TRAGESER: Well, I mean, you know, just to see
6	if another option flies with a different group here. I think
7	Option 4, you get that size down, you at least extend that
8	fishing time out to the middle of October. And it gets you
9	in before Memorial Day. I think for a smaller fish size that
10	is an
11	MR. GRACIE: Is that a motion
12	MR. TRAGESER: get an option.
13	MR. GRACIE: for Option 4. I will discuss it
14	after we get it on the table. Is there a second?
15	(No response)
16	MR. GRACIE: No second. Motion dies.
17	MR. COBURN: I had a lot of people say that they
18	would like to be able to start in April, fishing out.
19	MR. GAINES: That's a big deal of the sea sides.
20	Big deal.
21	MR. GRACIE: Motion? Come on, guys.
22	MOTION
23	MR. GARY: I will make a motion for Option 2.
24	MR. TRAGESER: I will second.
25	MR. GRACIE: That is Richie, seconded by Roger. If

anybody feels compelled to speak, I am going to glare at you. 2 3 (Laughter) 4 MR. GRACIE: Any discussion? 5 MR. GARY: Second by? 6 MR. GRACIE: Roger Trageser. All in favor of the 7 motion? Raise your hands. 8 (Show of hands) 9 MR. GARY: Three, four, five, six, seven, eight, 10 nine. 11 MR. GRACIE: Opposed? 12 (No response) 13 MR. GRACIE: Have an abstention. 14 MR. O'BRIEN: I have a comment that we get some 15 excellent input from guests here. 16 MR. GRACIE: Yes, we do. 17 MR. O'BRIEN: Very good input. Particularly I like 18 some of the things that you bought out. Now, on the Bay, 19 again, I am not getting conservation equivalency, which we 20 will -- train coming down the track, but in the Bay the 21 charter boats, so let's talk about charter boats. 22 If you catch a keeper flounder, that is a big, big 23 And it not only makes the person who caught it happy, deal. it makes the whole boat happy. 24 25 Now, for fishermen that are more professional

recreational fisherman, that target flounder, you know, again they're going do a heck of a lot better. But I just again need the people to recognize that we got a constituency out there, a lot of group parties, church groups and everything, and that is who we take out. And under this scenario they got very, very little chance.

MR. GRACIE: I think we understand that. I don't know that we have any other options this year. But maybe --- is going to help us. All right. We got to move on with the agenda. We're way behind now.

ASMFC update and then Atlantic Fisheries Advisory Council update.

MR. O'CONNELL: Can I come over here.

MR. GRACIE: You haven't even gotten to the controversial issue yet, guys.

## ASMFC & Mid Atlantic Council Update

## by Tom O'Connell, MD DNR Fisheries Services

MR. O'CONNELL: I will try to -- put us back on time. Atlantic States Marine and Fisheries Commission met the first week in February. And several of the Commissioners did make it out on the Tuesday, and I hope you enjoyed your time there and got a good feel on how the deliberations take place. All of you should have received a copy of the meeting summary. And just want to highlight a few things.

We've already talked about summer flounder. And

scup, which is not really an important Maryland species at the current time, it used to be. It's going to be status quo for scup. There are some changes going on in New England, but for the souther region, which Maryland is in, scup will remain the same.

Black sea bass, this has been a pretty heated topic over the wintertime. Last fall the black sea bass fishery was shut down because of projected harvesting, we were going to greatly exceed the harvest target. The council approved a harvest target for 2010, that was going to require I think a reduction of 66 percent. There was a lot of concerns related to the assessment that supported that specification. As a result the scientists got back together and recommended a different harvest target which reduced the reduction from 66 percent to 44 percent.

The Commission approved increasing the allowable catch for 2010 and past a motion that would provide a season of May 22<sup>nd</sup> to September 12<sup>th</sup>, contingent upon NMFS taking an emergency action to increase the overall quota. It turns out that this motion was also reviewed by the Mid-Atlantic Council and the Council decided upon a different season, which was a split season. I don't have the dates in my mind right now. Harley, can you mention what --

MR. SPIER: May  $22^{\rm nd}$  through August  $8^{\rm th}$ , and September  $4^{\rm th}$  through October  $4^{\rm th}$ .

1 MR. O'CONNELL: All right. And so there is some concerns from our coastal community that that's not the ideal 2 3 situation, but that's what's being recommended to the 4 Council. And has NMFS made a final ruling on that? 5 MS. KENNEDY: NMFS, it is -- does meet the 44 percent reduction. 6 7 MR. O'CONNELL: So it does meet the 44 percent 8 reduction. We're just waiting for the final emergency action 9 to be implemented by NMFS. 10 I am going to skip over striped and we'll end that 11 last because that's going probably require a little bit of 12 discussion. Weakfish management, as you remember we had to 13 implement a new management approach to meet the Amendment 14 requirements. For the recreational fishery, that's one fish. 15 Creel limit and that motion -- that management plan, that 16 was approved by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. 17 18 Let's see here. See, horseshoe crabs, they're 19 implemented the new addendum to look at whether or not 20 horseshoe crab fishery will remain status quo or change. 21 Just mentioned that I was voted in as the new Chair person 22 for the Horseshoe Crab Fishery Management Plan, Management 23 Board. 24 Bluefish, just a note worthy thing, there is going

to be an effort to try and get additional data on the middle

age classes of bluefish. And our staff may be following up 2 with some you, intercept bluefish to get some -- samples to 3 support that effort. 4 Shad and river herring, we already spoke about 5 river herring. We find ourselves in a similar situation withe Board approving the amendment for the American Shad 6 7 Plan. This is not going to have implications to Maryland. Our fisheries are already shut down. But all states are 8 9 going to have to put forth a sustainable fisheries plan in 10 order to allow their fisheries to continue, otherwise those 11 fisheries will be shut down in a couple of years. 12 It's very clear that catch-and-release fishing is 13 still allowed despite a state closing their fisheries. 14 Catch-and-release is treated differently for shad. 15 MR. GRACIE: Did you mention -- amendment on the 16 commercial quotas? 17 MR. O'CONNELL: No, the last --18 MR. GRACIE: Oh, okay. You're saving that for 19 last, all right. I just thought --20 MR. O'CONNELL: I thought I would try and get away 21 with not talking about it. 22 MR. GRACIE: Hopefully we'll run out of time. 23 MR. O'CONNELL: There's been a petition to enlist 24 Atlantic sturgeon as an endangered threatened species.

ASMFC policy board agreed to send a letter opposing the

enlistment of Atlantic sturgeon recognizing that by listing
Atlantic sturgeon as threatened or endangered it would
restrict our ability to monitor the resource because you
wouldn't be able to handle them. And the policy board agreed
to send that letter forward.

There is an effort to look at making black drum a coastal management species. There is going to be a data workshop to look into that topic.

MR. GRACIE: What does that mean?

MR. O'CONNELL: Right now black drum is managed by individual states. It is not coordinated coast wide. So because it's a coastal species there is an interest to develop a coastal fisheries management plan for black drum, like we have for striped bass, et cetera.

MR. GRACIE: Thank you.

MR. O'CONNELL: Now, to the striped bass. Maybe to highlight a couple of things. First, Captain Ed O'Brien came to the Striped Bass Board Meeting. And he gave a passionate plea to the Board during the public comment period, stressing the importance to address the illegal poaching activity that's going on in the recreational fishery, commercial fishery, off shore particularly in the EEZ area.

It was well received by the Management Board members. That is widely recognized against the long tenured Board members, and having Ed come to the table to bring up

concerns by recreational fishing really resonated with them.

As a result of that the Board recommended and the policy Board approved, sending a strong message, letter, to the National Fishery Service and the United States Coast Guard asking them to look at increasing the penalties associated with illegal activity off shore with striped bass.

That letter has been sent. We can scan that and get a copy out to you maybe tomorrow. As a result of that we have already seen some positive responses with some cases that were made in the past week, with poaching activity off shore. So, thanks, Ed, for making that plea. And I think the Commission is very supportive of taking this action off shore.

There were a couple of other -- there was the -Striped Bass Management Board had a focus presentation by the
Technical Committee which reviewed several different tasks.
All that information should be available on line. One topic was mycobacteriosis. And there were three scientists that came and spoke about what we have learned over the years with mycob.

Technical Committee has reported concerns about the increased natural mortality rate, specifically in the Chesapeake Bay and mycobacteriosis may have -- be a reason for that, and such the presentation was provided and it's available on line.

Let's see -- the major issue that happened at the Striped Bass Management Board meeting was -- and -- another discussion about whether or not the coastal commercial quota for striped bass should be increased. A little history, back in May of last year, there was a motion to initiate an addendum to allow an increase to the coastal commercial quota. And that motion failed.

There was a second motion to establish and addendum to allow the rollover of any unused coastal commercial quota. That addendum went through the public process of being drafted, public comment. In November that addendum was not approved by the management board.

The new stock assessments for striped bass was presented in November. And I will go over that in a couple of -- in a minute.

But ultimately the New York Commissioner, asked for an agenda item and put the issue back on the table to initiate an addendum that would allow the increase in the coastal commercial striped bass. And Marty, if you could bring up the directory for that flash drive.

The motion ultimately passed by a narrow margin of eight to seven. Maryland did cast a positive vote to go through the process of developing the addendum. And the Board will be -- just bear with me one second.

(Pause)

MR. O'CONNELL: So this is the stocks -- I just want to highlight a few things to help explain some of my reasoning personally for voting for the motion and for Maryland casting a supporting vote at this point in time.

(Slide)

You know, we've had a lot of discussion on striped bass recently, particularly with catch-and-release fishing. And one hand, if you look at this graph, you can see that overall the striped bass stock appears to be in a good condition. We're still 150 percent above the spawning stock biomass target. And the fish and mortality rate is well below the fish and mortality target.

That said, this assessment highlighted some concerns about the status of the stock. We've seen a period of low recruitment that's projected to result in a continued decrease in the spawning stock biomass. We've seen increased natural mortality with mycobacteriosis. We have states the extreme ranges of striped bass, particularly in the New England, that's highlighting the fact that they're no longer seeing the big.

There is just a lot of concerns regarding what the stock is going to look like in the years ahead of us. And that was the principal reason why we took a very careful look at the expanding catch-and-release fishery. Which we didn't prohibit altogether, but we put some guardrails on it.

(Slide)

One of the concerns that's been expressed by the coastal commercial community -- you can really get to with this graph here. And the coastal -- just to clarify, the coastal commercial fishery is not talking about the Chesapeake Bay commercial fishery. It's specific to the coastal fishery in Maryland and long the coast.

And one of the concerns is, over time because the commercial fishery is managed under a quota system, those landings have been relatively constant throughout the last, you know, 10, 13 years. However, the recreational landings, which is more managed which are, you know, seasons and size limits, that fishery has increased significantly over that same time frame.

And it's a matter of bringing the issue to the table to have an honest discussion as to why -- those that may be opposed to looking at an increase in the coastal commercial quota. I think you also need to reflect upon what's going on in the recreational fishery coast wide to see if we also need to have that same discussion amongst the recreational fishing.

And the one thing I did --

MR. GRACIE: Before you do, can I ask a question?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. GRACIE: Before you do -- my understanding is

that the commercial fishery hasn't met it's quota recently, is that correct? They went under their quota. 2 3 MR. O'CONNELL: For Maryland or --4 MR. GRACIE: No, coastal. 5 MR. O'CONNELL: Coast line. That's why they wanted an 6 MR. GRACIE: Yes. amendment to have a carry over, wasn't it? 7 8 VOICE: No, certain. 9 MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. Certain states, in 10 particularly North Carolina, have not been meeting their 11 commercial quota because they believe the fish have moved 12 offshore. 13 MR. GRACIE: Okay. 14 MR. O'CONNELL: And they were the ones that were 15 initially pushing for the rollover quota to just bank those 16 fish in case the fish came back in shore. But I think most 17 states have been meeting --18 MR. GRACIE: At their quota. 19 MR. O'CONNELL: -- at their quota. 20 MR. GRACIE: Okay. 21 MR. O'CONNELL: So the one that has intrigued me 22 is, you know, me and my staff went down and met with our 23 coastal community in January. And this issue was number two 24 on their priority list. And I thought it was important to

allow the discussion to continue. I am not sure where

Maryland's votes ultimately are going to lie with this. 2 But I thought it was worthy of more discussion, not 3 only for the fairness issue but the commercial coastal guys, 4 but also to hear from those who may be opposed and why they 5 are opposed. 6 One other thing that may be of interest to you. 7 Marty, if you can get me back to the directory. 8 (Pause) 9 You guys can see that graph. 10 (Slide) 11 Interestingly the last -- the trends in Maryland 12 are different then along the coast. You can see that the red 13 line is the recreational harvest. And that has been going up 14 over the last number of years. But the Bay commercial 15 harvest has also been increasing. 16 And the reason that is, within the Chesapeake Bay, 17 we manage under fish and mortality rates. And as the stock 18 has increased over the last several years, so has the fishery 19 for both the commercial and recreational landings. 20 The yellow line is the recreational discards, all 21 fish that are caught and released. And there is mortality 22 associated with those. And while it's been decreasing in 23 Maryland, I am told that the recreational discards coast wide exceed the commercial harvest. 24

The bottom line is Maryland's Atlantic Commercial

Fishery. While the Chesapeake Bay commercial and recreational landings are managed under fish and mortality rate, the Atlantic commercial fishery in Maryland is under a fixed quota. And that quota has not changed over time. And I think it's worthy of this discussion. You know, the fisheries in the Bay have been able to increase and decrease based upon stock levels, but the Atlantic commercial fishery has not.

So, looking at all these issues and not having a lot of time to discuss it, because it was an issue that was added to the Board agenda, my view and Russell Diez's view was to support the motion at this time to initiate an addendum to consider increasing the coastal commercial quota. The next step would be for the technical planned development team to put the addendum together.

It's going to come back to the Management Board in May. The Management Board will review the issues and determine whether or not that addendum should go forth for public comment. And then the Board would act upon it in August.

The last time the Technical Committee reviewed such an issue it projected that the -- you know, increasing the coastal commercial quota by up to 25 percent, I believe it was, would have an effect on the fish and mortality rate of .01. Similar to a level, worst case scenario, for

catch-and-release, and I know that there are some people that are comparing this to the decision of catch-and-release -- and while I think there's some comparison to be made, there's also some difference. We're talking pre-spawn fish for catch-and-release and these Atlantic fish are not pre-spawn.

So, that's the background I wanted to present on that topic. And I am sure there will be some questions.

MR. GRACIE: All right. I am going to allow some questions. We're behind schedule. And we got other issues to discuss. But -- comments, questions?

#### Questions and Answers

MR. COBURN: My concern is on the addendum. It said -- quota goes up, are they going to try and tap into the recreational quota?

MR. O'CONNELL: No, it's not a matter of reallocating the available fish. It would be a matter of increasing the -- quota for the coastal commercial striped bass fishery.

MR. GRACIE: Ed.

MR. O'BRIEN: Amazingly, if I am right, the Technical Committee acknowledged that there is no estimate for poaching in there.

MR. O'CONNELL: No. Mike ---, he's the DNRMP officer with the Commission, he gave the best report -- or he gave a report on the best available information on poaching

on the Commission meeting. Recognized -- it was recognized as a significant problem of concern. And actually a work group has been formed between a Law Enforcement Committee and the Technical Committee to try to come up with a monitoring program to get a better handle on it.

MR. O'BRIEN: But this is the first meeting we ever got them to do that?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Now, North Carolina, of course, is different then all the other states when it comes to its cooperation with the estimating of the catch. Didn't Tidal Fish come up with a motion in this area, I think, Brian made it. And I believe that motion was that the -- if this passes, this addendum, that it be taken out of the North Carolina catch, because of poaching. What was it exactly?

MR. KEEHN: Well, part of the issue was that it's kind of indicative to that southern fishery, the North Carolina/Virginia coastal fishery.

MR. O'BRIEN: Right.

MR. KEEHN: And over the last four or five years, the industry that those rockfish haven't gone down in North Carolina, where five years ago North Carolina was a problem. Now, the last five years Virginia.

In the estimated harvest for that Virginia/North Carolina fishery, which MRFSS is not really tracking --

MR. O'BRIEN: Not even following it.

MR. KEEHN: Not even following was between 200,000 and 800,000 fish. Just for recreational. So the commercial guys were all talking, the reason they want to raise the commercial is because the recreational on that coast has gotten so high. And our take on it, was that you're allowed two fish per person. The captain may allow two fish --

So, like in Maryland, when we catch fish, we're allowed six fish, go home. That same boat can go off the coast of Virginia and catch 16 fish. So our take was kind of -- on that coastal -- that lower coastal -- is the lower of the recreational catch for one fish per person and leave the commercial catch alone.

The commercial guys are one with the recreational hats. But what we recognize and I think Ed's point is that fishery down there will put us back into a moratorium. More 50 pound fish, you see state -- I think the state record in North Carolina was broke the other day. The state record for Virginia was broke last year. These are 60 and 70 pound fish that are getting taken.

And that's our concern is that -- and MRFSS isn't even tracking it. So, we don't even really know what's coming out of there, and that's our major concern.

MR. O'BRIEN: But does the Tide Water have a motion?

1 MR. KEEHN: Yes, to reduce -- rather then increase 2 commercial, reduce the recreational catch. 3 MR. GOLDSBOROUGH: In that fishery. 4 MR. KEEHN: In that fishery. 5 MR. O'CONNELL: The Tidal Fish Advisory Commission approved the motion unanimously to oppose the increase in 6 7 coastal commercial striped bass. And also recommended 8 reducing the take from it's Virginia/North Carolina fishery. 9 MR. O'BRIEN: That's right. It wasn't reduced the 10 recreational catch, was it? 11 It was opposed a commercial increase 12 and to recommend a reduction on that Virginia/North Carolina 13 coastal recreational catch. 14 MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. Just Virginia/North Carolina. 15 MR. KEEHN: Yes. 16 MR. O'BRIEN: I don't know --17 MR. KEEHN: I don't know how --18 MR. O'BRIEN: It certainly makes a point. 19 MR. KEEHN: That was our intention. 20 MR. O'BRIEN: I mean, you know, sitting around 21 here, you know, you think there is some real order to all 22 this, and face -- they don't even estimate when they come up 23 with these numbers, they don't even estimate the bycatch. 24 They don't even estimate it. They don't estimate the 25 I mean they got a tough job, granted, because it's

federal waters.

But, you know, it ends up backlashing on us so many times when we go in there and want to do something and we lose by one vote, two votes, particularly the battles we've had on the trophy seasons. And those battles are right around the corner again. The younger the year thing, what's going on out there. Everybody knows this. Sports writers in Maine are writing about it. Sports writers in Florida.

So, we've got some real problems ahead on striped bass and that's why we were trying to look at ways that we could come back a little bit.

When I sat in the Advisor's Meeting, all I heard about was bycatch. And that is going to be the subject of the next advice to the Commissioners. This was coming from sports writers, from New Jersey, Al Ristori and people like that, you know. They know what's going on here, they read our papers, and, you know, we're going to be facing a difficult situation once there is a hiccup in the spawning biomass. Not that. We're talking about the spawning biomass.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, the spawning stock biomass is projected to decrease because of the poor juvenile recruitment in the last several years.

MR. GRACIE: Okay. Let's keep moving on. Richie.

MR. GAINES: I think Tom made some really good

points if you look at it, at the commercial level. They're really good points.

But I think when you throw everything into context, and I look at the spike in number up there, you pick recreational or you can pick commercial, it's about 650,000, 700,000 fish. They're estimating 200,000 to 800,000 in that winter fishery that aren't even accounted for. That's -- that's equal to one of our major fisheries. Which one do we want to throw out, recreational or commercial.

So, I mean when you take it in context, that's scary. But you made great points when you just look at the commercial side of it.

MR. O'CONNELL: Well, excuse me, and I need to make this point, I forgot but, you know, going through that catch-and-release and looking at the complete stock assessment, my sense is that we're in a period of that we should be trying to achieve stabilization. There's enough uncertainty in the status and the stock, that I think we need to let things play off for a couple of years to the next stock assessment before we start looking to expand fisheries.

You know, I think we should be very fortunate of the sacrifice of the past that have the quality of fishery that we have today. And I think we should be trying to preserve that. And, you know -- with that said, I thought it was worthy of going through a discussion, despite what --

there may be some things on Tidalfish.com or other sources of 2 information. This isn't a done deal. It's a process to go 3 through. Suggesting tracking this addendum. There are two 4 more voting sessions before it becomes final. 5 And I guess the last point is despite what the Capital wrote, I am not the new Chair of the Technical 6 7 Committee with Striped Bass. I was nominated as the new 8 Vice-Chair for the Management Board, which makes me Chair in 9 two years. 10 MR. GRACIE: Thank you, Tom. Are we going to 11 finish at 9:00? Do we have to get out of here? Because 12 we're going to go over if we go through -- the rest of the 13 agenda. 14 MR. GARY: We should be okay for a few minutes. 15 MR. GRACIE: Who is going to present the 16 Flexibility in the Magnuson discussion? 17 MR. GARY: Steve Early, over here. 18 MR. GRACIE: Steve. Do you know about how long 19 you're going to take, Steve, because we're going to need some 20 time for discussion, I am sure. 21 MR. EARLY: I can go over basics in about five 22 minutes. Or less. 23 MR. GRACIE: It will be worth it if it doesn't 24 prolong the questions. 25 (Laughter)

MR. GRACIE: Go ahead.

## 2

1

### 3

### 4

# 5

# 6 7

# 8

# 9

#### 10

# 11

# 12

# 13

### 14

# 15

### 16

# 17

# 18

# 19

#### 20

# 21

## 22

23

24

25

#### Flexibility to Fish Act Discussion

#### by Steve Early, MD DNR Fisheries Services

MR. EARLY: Okay. The HR-1584 Federal Act for Flexibility and Rebuilding American Fisheries is an act named at -- amending the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act. That Act basically effects management in federal water, EEZ. Management under the Council, not management under the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Magnuson-Stevens is basically written as a reaction to socioeconomic management. It's a conservation act. And it was intended to address conservation as expeditiously as possible. And there is a section within 304E, which is what the Flexibility Act is, trying to address which -- basically says that for an over-fished stock, there should be a plan to recover within 10 years.

There are conditions relating to the status of the stock, environmental conditions. There are recommendation within the National Standards to consider socioeconomic data.

What has happed in short-hand, real simplistic terms, is that socioeconomic information, information on participation of communities, participation of fisheries, has essentially taken a back seat to the conservation part of managing fisheries. And the 10 year time frame for many

fisheries is a pretty good time frame in which you should be able to rebuild.

The Flexibility Act attempts to look at other issues and address them on a more equal footing, if you will, or perhaps even a greater footing, depending upon your point of view, and there is a lot you can read on the internet, with conservation. It seeks to address socioeconomic conditions more directly. It seeks to build into the equation commercial, residential, agricultural development, water quality conditions.

It introduces a couple of new terms where the Secretary may extend the time frame, positive rebuilding, positive rebuilding means substantial. Substantial is left up in the air. And since substantial is up in the air, so is positive rebuilding.

And leaves up in the air issues such as if you have positive rebuilding for what period of time. The period of time when it begins is indicated. The period of time at which it may end is not indicated. So, it introduces some ambiguity into the act.

The flexibility, the Act being Magnuson-Stevens

Act. The flexibility is essentially within Magnuson-Stevens,

it has not been well incorporated. We lack good

socioeconomic information on virtually every fishery. That's

just the standard. We often now, for fisheries that -- the

earlier fisheries were probably the easiest to work with because we had more data for them. They were more important fisheries. Fisheries that are now coming on line for management, and I believe there are about 70 stocks in the South Atlantic, the information is going to be worse. It is definitely not going to be as good as what you had before.

So, you're going to be entering a period in which management in trying to weigh socioeconomic information and stock information is going to get worse.

The Flexibility Act attempts to address the socioeconomic end. And the data poor end. It may not go far enough in addressing issues that are of concern to managers. For example, one of the standards is that over-fishing be ended immediately. There are some feeling on the part of managers that that is perhaps not absolutely necessary that you end over-fishing immediately.

And I am not talking about directed over-fishing, but you may have over-fishing continuing where, particularly in the South Atlantic again, you have reef stocks where it's almost impossible not to catch a non-target fish. And not to have essentially over-fishing occurring even after it was supposed to have ended.

You all, I believe, received via e-mail, both the Flexibility Act and Magnuson-Stevens. The question in our minds is well, what exactly is the Flexibility Act trying to

achieve. Is it simply trying to achieve a longer time frame for rebuilding to occur. If that is the case, then what it is doing is taking risk and building risk onto the fish, as opposed to the fishery.

The original intent was to move risk from the fish to the fisheries, provide for rebuilding and is -- in a short a time frame as possible, get fisheries operating again and thereby optimize the return from the fish and to the fisheries.

And what we're looking for in this discussion really is what are the perspectives from the Commission as to what are the issues. Is this a process issue. Is this really a substantive procedural issue. Is something going drastically wrong. Have conditions change such that you need to look back -- and Ed and I had a discussion earlier -- Fisheries Management doesn't necessarily proceed smoothly down any track. It's like many other things, you move to one side, the teeter-todder tips, you try and move back to the other side. Constantly trying to find where your balance is.

So, our questions are, what are the concerns. Are the concerns related to socioeconomic information, the availability of it. Is it related to the data on fish stocks. Are there very specific problems with FCMA, Fishery Conservation and Management Act as opposed to just the way NOAA and the Councils move through their policy procedures

and develop Fisheries Management plans.

Certainly if these are data kinds of issues and part of it is that, it's only going to come with time, money and resources. And the one thing you can be guaranteed is that they're short and not necessarily going to get any longer.

However, from a management prospective weakening the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act to provide for lengthened rebuilding times, does not necessarily serve the community any more then it serves the fish.

So, with that we're interested in a discussion about what are the really directed concerns about FCMA and how could that be perhaps more directly addressed in a bill to amend it.

MR. GRACIE: I just want to make sure before we open questions, I have one question I am not sure you made clear, maybe you're assuming everybody read what came out. My understanding of the main thrust of the Act is that it gives the Secretary the option of lengthening the time period under certain conditions, which you say aren't fully defined. But it doesn't automatically lengthen the recovery time.

MR. EARLY: It does not though. The Secretary determine in any of that, how the plan proceeds and what the plan is. And in each case, and there are half a dozen cases,

it provides that the Secretary will determine the length of time.

#### Questions and Answers

MR. GRACIE: Ed, go ahead.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's very fair, Steve. The last sentence, I guess, is where you and I had a little disagreement.

Now, this all started down in the Gulf. And the spearhead of it was the National Charter Boat Association.

And a lot of other people have jumped on board. All five Governors in the Gulf States have taken a position in support of this amendment. I don't know all the legal ins and outs of it. I am not a lawyer. But some lawyers have been involved with it.

This is a Tea Party, that's what it is. It's trying to get some attention here when it comes to the problems that result from MRFSS, from very bad data collection, particularly down in the Gulf where people never forget that during certain hurricanes they were showing catches of their fish that never occurred because boats never went out.

So there is a lot of disrespect down there towards
Magnuson. There's worries that the new system isn't going to
be much better. And I do think that may be a little unfair.
But it's intense. It is a social and economic as you can get

because it involves people making a living and people's quality of life through their recreation.

Now, subsequently, the Northeast has picked up on it. Right on down through New Jersey. I am not sure about Delaware. But there are going to be bus loads coming down to a very confusing thing that is trying to get attention to a real socioeconomic problem. And there's nothing wrong with that. It's about time. It's about time.

Now, typically throughout the country and in Washington, you know, people who are concerns -- the biologists are worried just like you mentioned, that this is going to denigrate conservation. Well, that's one side of it. The other side of it is, hey, there's a lot in the middle that's got to be recognized relative to the socioeconomic situation here. So, it's a move to get attention. And hopefully to get that amendment through. This is not going to stop this year. This is just the start.

I want to add one other thing. That it seems like this issue dovetails with catch shares. Because the same people are very upset with catch shares, and very upset, again, with the federal push to implement them just as they're upset with the federal defensiveness when it comes to challenging Magnuson.

So that's just some generalizations I wanted to throw out there because, you know, we're intimately involved

with them. I am Vice-Chairman of the National Charter Boat Association.

MR. GRACIE: We got a few minutes. I would like to hear from Commissioners if they have anything to say about it. I don't know whether we're ready to take a position on anything tonight. But Ed's talking about, I guess, everybody knows is there is a march on Washington on Wednesday in support of this. I think this is the third year this bill has been introduced. It was at Palenville for two years. Congressman Palon from New Jersey, was the sponsor. I guess he's behind it now, isn't he? I think his name is on it.

MR. GRACIE: Yes.

MR. EARLY: It's interesting that talking -Lynn Fagley has talked to biologists from South Atlantic
Council. And their concern is not about the rebuilding
periods. They think they could live with the rebuilding
period as it exists. Or even these amended rebuilding
periods, which I think are somewhat difficult to interpret
what they would actually mean.

But their concern is with this notion of ending over-fishing and how expeditiously that happens. They've got stocks that have been over-fished, continue to be over-fished and are in fact growing. They're still technically over-fished, and still technically in violation. They would simply like to see the issue of that definition of

over-fishing addressed.

MR. O'BRIEN: Oh, that's a good point. I am worried about this because what I might see down stream, two, three -- well, three or four years on striped bass, for some of these things that are going on now.

MR. GRACIE: Ed.

MR. SIKORSKI: One thing that has been resonating through all the arguments we haven't -- not arguments, sorry, the discussions we've had with regard to fisheries is bad data. And I think that is something that has definitely spawned this issue.

The reauthorization of Magnuson -- some would say have some pretty points in it. But what's missing -- to kind of support -- some of the requirements of it are data. Which determines when you close a fishery. And ultimately you close a fishery you have issues which arise, economic issues which arise.

So, like Ed was saying, there's a -- one side is the conservation side and then you have another side which is a socioeconomic effect. And there is a necessity for middle ground to be found. So jobs aren't lost. Because it's a continuation of bad data and making bad decisions on bad data. And it has to come to a stop.

And a question would be, does anybody have any idea what the hopes, what National Marine Fisheries' hopes are, a

Τ

time line where --- may come on line and give some sort of good data where these decisions can be made in the future?

mean is there some sort of -- are they saying that we hope

X number of years from now something, we'll have something?

No.

MR. EARLY: They are gradually changing from Marine Recreational Fishing Survey to new survey methodologies. You may well not see something that says, begin and end. In fact you want to continue the methodology of the old survey as you start a new survey so that you can then use new data to look back at old data and understand what was going on. It gives you a longer stream of data essentially.

MR. SIKORSKI: One other thing, I have concerns with the ambiguity in legislation, it is just, you know, mild concern. Because we can't tell the future and things do change. So one thing that you may be introducing now which makes sense to have some ambiguity to it, or some flexibility, may not make sense in the future as things progress.

MR. EARLY: Well, one of the issues with this, that causes problems, and we tend to focus on the time frame, the 10 year, the Secretary is required at a couple year intervals to review plans, review stock statuses. And one of the sections of this bill would allow the Secretary should review other factors that are effecting over-fished stocks in

determining how management should proceed. And those include industrial development, commercial residential development, agricultural activity, environmental and ecological changes.

And I very well appreciate that those things do in fact effect fish stocks. However, trying to use those to mitigate a rebuilding process is really, in my mind, delving into some sort witchcraft, beyond that which is, even now may be practiced. Those things certainly need to be addressed. But to use those as a foil to extend rebuilding time, does not lead you down the appropriate conservation avenue.

MR. SIKORSKI: I fully understand.

MR. EARLY: And so that's -- that's where I would be looking --

MR. GRACIE: You're characterizing that decision by the Secretary as a foil to extend rebuilding time? That's what you just said, Steve.

MR. EARLY: By the crafters of this bill.

MR. GRACIE: Oh, okay.

MR. EARLY: Which is where I would think you need something that is more directed and more objective. And that in fact means, in my mind, that you can't go very far outside of what you know about stock status. It doesn't suggest that we should ignore those things. In fact those are the very things which the bi-annual meeting this year with NOAA, I thought was the most important thing we were there to

Because if we aren't discussing habitat, and we discuss. aren't doing something about habitat, you can kiss fishery 2 3 management good-bye. 4 MR. GRACIE: Right. That is why I am --MR. EARLY: It's over. 5 MR. GRACIE: -- wondering that way -- put it that 6 7 way. Dave. 8 Probably a bad choice of words. MR. EARLY: 9 MR. D. SMITH: I guess what -- remind me again, of 10 why sport fishing, what our goal is with sport fishing, in 11 this Flexibility Bill. What are we looking to get out of 12 this -- conversation. MR. GRACIE: The ability, primarily the ability to 13 extend the rebuilding time. 14 15 MR. D. SMITH: No, I mean --16 MR. GRACIE: If --17 MR. D. SMITH: -- why are we taking it up in sport 18 fishery right now. Why are we --19 MR. GRACIE: Oh, because there is a bill that has 20 been introduced in Congress. There is a big public event 21 this Wednesday. And it may very well be that our Fisheries 22 Commission would like some input from the Commission before they're asked by the Congressional Delegation where they 23 should stand on the bill. 24 25 We would also like to be able to help MR. EARLY:

inform a better bill, if that becomes a possibility. And Edhas many different perspectives from his seat with National Charter Boat. And our issues are not at all the same as necessarily as southern issues.

MR. SIKORSKI: I think it's important as commercialers until we become informed on this issue because it's going to be a big issue and our constituency -- you know, it's going to come up with our constituents, in order to make well informed decision in the future to the Department when they ask for more guidance. I think you really need to delve into this.

We met the -- the attachment you sent to us for Magnuson-Stevens was what 178 pages. I tried to get through part if it, but I mean, you know --

MR. EARLY: This, by the way, another reason would be that our Fisheries Management Plan Authority in Maryland law basically floats from Magnuson-Stevens. So what you see here could well get reflected in a bill to the Maryland General Assembly.

MR. GRACIE: I don't know if everybody is aware but during the debate of the reauthorization of Magnuson-Stevens, Recreational Fishing Organization brought up this issue and objected to this fixed time line during the whole process. So this is not a new issue.

MR. D. SMITH: Okay, I know. I just --

MR. GRACIE: It came to a head last year when the -- it came to a big head when the black sea bass fishery got shut down last year, last fall. So -- here is a fishery that was above its target, was rebuilt, and got over fish in one year and they shut it down. And they put thousands of people out of business for six months. So that -- people viewed that as the drastic consequence of Magnuson-Stevens without any flexibility when it wasn't -- most people -- well, recreational fishermen viewed that as it's unnecessary. I don't know if most people would agree with that, but yes. So I mean it's a hot issue.

I think Dave Sikorski is right, and everybody is right, we need to get informed on it. I don't expect us to make a decision on it tonight. I don't think you guys are going to go home and read Magnuson-Stevens tonight.

Some of the people in this Commission followed that bill. Bill Windley was one of them. Who was very much involved in that through the whole process, as I am sure you know.

MR. D. SMITH: Yes.

MR. GRACIE: He's not here tonight, unfortunately. But in any rate I thought we needed to have presentation on it. Get a chance to discuss it. Let's come back next month better informed. The bill is probably not going to depend on our input in the next month, for anything to happen. It's

been going on for three years, that's why I say that. 2 MS. KENNEDY: Can I just--3 MR. GRACIE: Yes, go ahead, Carrie. 4 MS. KENNEDY: Can I just add one thing. We have a 5 couple of anglers from the coast, not only who are organizing to go on Wednesday, but also who have gone to the congressmen 6 7 and their senators and spoken directly about supporting this 8 So we do have people, anglers in Maryland that are bill. 9 already talking to their national legislators about support 10 and have asked us for, you know, for --- and for support. I certainly encourage more of that. 11 12 MR. GRACIE: And continued discussion. 13 MR. D. SMITH: Jim, can I --14 MR. GRACIE: Yes. 15 MR. D. SMITH: You know, MSSA is involved with this 16 bill and we've been asked to support it. And we are going to 17 support this bill. We have numerous chapters throughout the 18 state that are getting buses together full of our members and 19 going down there. So I think it's important. I think 20 everybody should go home and read it, Magnuson-Stevens, and 21 read the amendment, because I think it will have some 22 positive outcome. 23 MR. GRACIE: Right. We're not finished yet. We 24 still have a couple more items on the agenda. Are we 25

Thank you, Steve.

finished with that now?

1 MR. EARLY: Thank you. 2 Diamond Jim Update. MR. GRACIE: 3 Diamond Jim Update 4 by Marty Gary, MD DNR Fisheries Services 5 MR. GARY: Mr. Chairman, we're five minutes over, but out of respect of the hard work of several Commissioners 6 7 I would like to have that full 10 minutes if I could. 8 promise I will send you out on a good note. 9 MR. GRACIE: All right. You got it. Go ahead. 10 MR. GARY: Real quick, in 2005, at a Stakeholder's 11 Meeting, Kent Narrows, the Department was delivered a message 12 that we could do a better job promoting the diversity and 13 quality of the sport fishing opportunities here in the state. 14 And so we sought to do just that by having -- developing long 15 term management -- or marketing plans, within the Sport Fish Commission. 16 And the Sport Fish Commission, prior to this group, 17 18 and we do have two incumbents who were participating at that 19 time, did make some headway along those lines. And that is 20 something that we may want to take up at -- in the not too 21 distant future. But also in the shorter term, we tried to 22 create a fishing festival or contest to generate some 23 enthusiasm. We start off in 2005 with a several week contest on 24

Chesapeake Bay involving four species of fish. Using input

from the Commission and our stakeholder groups we are now into our sixth year and we've expanded it to a complete -- state inclusive context, all across the state, not just the Chesapeake Bay, over 60 different species of fish, youth events, it's been totally inclusive.

We -- it's been pretty successful, I think, until we hit this economic wall in the last year or so where we lost a lot of our sponsorship. But just in the last few weeks through a lot of the Stakeholder Groups, out at the Law Enforcement Summit, we got a mandate to go ahead and go forward with this. We convened a meeting of the sport fishing groups and we had 23 different groups represented just a couple of weeks ago, that totally support it, going forward with the contest, keeping it's basic structure and expanding where we can.

We still had the daunting roadblock of having promotion sponsorship through our major sponsors. And thanks to some hard work by both Larry Coburn and his colleagues at Bass Pro Shop and Dave Smith with the World Fishing Networks and other within MSSA, we've made some significant headway.

So I would like to actually turn it over -- I guess first, Dave, I would just acknowledge World Fishing Network as one -- groups you've worked with.

MR. D. SMITH: Yes.

MR. GARY: But they're willing to put, I think, several thousand dollars into this years contest.

MR. D. SMITH: Yes, quite a bit. I think it's closer to \$10,000.00 towards this. Just kind of putting together a grand prize fishing trip for whoever wins it. So they're looking, they're very interested in it.

MR. GARY: Excellent. And then Larry, you have been great working with some of the folks there in the shop and communicating to corporate how important it is for Bass Pro Shops, you want to share some of the discussions you've had. It is awesome.

MR. COBURN: Yes. I mean we've been relaying every bit of information we can get -- on this event is being promoted. So with getting this information to corporate, and their budget really got tight, they just became sponsors of PBR, Professional Bull Riding Association or whatever. A lot of their monies went that way.

We were still to wedge out and they're donating a boat again this year for the event, which I think is a great prize. But in -- I was talking to Marty earlier, we have some vendor association at the store, of course, and one of those vendors is Under Armor and it looks like we've gotten Under Armor's attention and they're going to come on board with some stuff, too. So, it's starting to roll in the right direction.

1 MR. GARY: Great. 2 MR. GRACIE: Way to go, Larry. 3 MR. GARY: And also Bass Pro Shop, Larry, and Aaron 4 and company have a long relationship with Toyota, which was 5 with us for several years. But it looks like Joe Evans, is it still with us? Joe left? Joe has been working with Larry 6 7 and Aaron with our past contact there. And there's a very 8 good chance Toyota will jump back on board. 9 So, I just wanted to thank everybody for their hard 10 work. You know, it's the people's -- the fishermen's contest 11 and their groups. And their total unanimity in supporting 12 We also just got our twenty-fourth group on board. 13 weren't able to join us today. We had the meeting. But it's 14 the Chesapeake Women Anglers Group. 15 And we also want this contest to -- to help in --16 help bring more young ladies and older ladies on board, get 17 more women fishing. 18 And really, if you haven't see this -- please. 19 think this is worth seeing if you haven't seen it. Hopefully 20 it will pop up here. Great timing because we're able to get 21 this over to Springfield, Larry's group, it's the Outdoors 22 Maryland Sequence, did anybody see that at all? 23 You are going to like this. This is eight minutes 24 and this thing sells the whole contest. I hope you enjoy it.

It's going to have to start first.

MR. GRACIE:

1	MR. GARY: I think it will start. Despite me.
2	Here it goes. We might even get sound.
3	(Video Presentation)
4	MR. GARY: I would just say thanks to Larry, thanks
5	to Dave, thanks to Val, thanks to everyone. Thanks for all
6	the different groups.
7	MR. GRACIE: Before any Commissioners leave, I
8	mean, anybody from the public wants to say anything, we
9	certainly would like to hear it. This is your opportunity.
10	Complaints?
11	(No response)
12	MR. GARY: Next meeting is March 22 <sup>nd</sup> .
13	(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	ı